

## VIRGINIA

E. LeRoy Smith, Appomattox.  
 Thomas E. Chambers, Blackstone.  
 Anna G. Bengtson, Catawba Sanatorium.  
 James F. Walker, Fort Defiance.  
 John W. Rodgers, Hampden Sydney.  
 Samuel S. Stallings, Suffolk.  
 Troy J. Weeks, Willis.

## WISCONSIN

Joseph K. Hesselink, Cedar Grove.  
 Carl Whitaker, Chetek.  
 Ina E. Hennlich, Curtiss.  
 Alma M. Oik, Hortonville.  
 Joseph S. Rosera, Lena.  
 Axel C. Swanson, Pembine.  
 William A. Weier, Wabeno.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 13, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, our Father, for our sins we ask the forgiveness of the Cross and for our guidance the benediction of Thy love and care. Thou, who art so prodigal with the riches of field and forest, of land and sea, how much more has been the glory of Thy gifts to the souls of men. O Son of Mary, walk with us; teach us the lessons of forbearance that we may forgive as we hope to be forgiven. Bless those who struggle against want. We pray that the doors of employment may be opened wide and that the hearts of men may be opened to help the world's sad needs; may those who have much share with those who have less. Immortalize the hopes of those lives that have been blighted and the sanctities of those who are lonely and in tears; transfigure human sorrow, lighten the darkness, and dwell among us. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5407) entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States,' approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WHEELER, Mr. BONE, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. TOBEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4929) entitled "An act to amend the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 944)," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. HALE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1939

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably without amendment (H. Rept. No. 1114) a privileged concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate on the bill (S. 2009) entitled "Transportation Act of 1939," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session on the bill (S. 2009) entitled "Transportation Act of 1939."*

The concurrent resolution was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON PROFIT-SHARING SYSTEMS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably without amendment (H. Rept. No. 1115) a privileged concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Finance on the Investigation of Existing Profit-Sharing Systems Between Employers and Employees in the United States, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Finance of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 10,000 additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of said committee during the Seventy-fifth Congress pursuant to the resolution (S. Res. 215) providing for an investigation of existing profit-sharing systems between employers and employees in the United States.*

The concurrent resolution was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 610, ON PROFIT SHARING

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably without amendment (H. Rept. No. 1116) a privileged concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 610 entitled "Survey of Experiences in Profit Sharing and Possibilities of Incentive Taxation," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 12,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 610, a report of a subcommittee of the Committee on Finance submitted pursuant to Senate Resolution 215 (75th Cong.), entitled "Survey of Experiences in Profit Sharing and Possibilities of Incentive Taxation," of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room, 10,000 copies for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance, and 1,000 copies for the House document room.*

The concurrent resolution was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## STATUE OF WILL ROGERS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably without amendment (H. Rept. No. 1117) a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) to print and bind the proceedings of Congress, together with the proceedings at the unveiling in the rotunda, upon acceptance of the statue of Will Rogers, presented by the State of Oklahoma, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed with illustrations and bound, in such form and style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, the proceedings in Congress at the unveiling in the rotunda, together with such other matter as the joint committee may deem pertinent thereto, upon the occasion of the acceptance of the statue of Will Rogers, presented by the State of Oklahoma, 5,200 copies; of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,700 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining 1,500 copies shall be for the use of and distribution by the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oklahoma.*

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer, who shall provide suitable illustrations to be bound with these proceedings.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, may I say it was my understanding that there was to be placed in that document only one illustration of the statue as it is in the rotunda of the Capitol. No great number of illustrations was to be placed in the document.

Mr. JARMAN. I did not understand there was any great number of them.

Mr. RICH. It was my impression there was only one illustration.

Mr. JARMAN. My understanding was that the proceedings and what happened in the House in connection with that incident were to be printed.

Mr. RICH. That is right; but the resolution refers to illustrations. I was under the impression there was only one illustration of the monument as it was presented and now stands in the rotunda of the Capitol.

Mr. JARMAN. That was my impression also.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADDITIONAL CLERK HIRE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6205) to provide for additional clerk hire in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I explain my position on this bill by saying that I realize it is not our duty in the House to interfere with the transactions and legislation of the Senate, but it does seem to me that our conferees should request of the Senate that when they are considering additional clerk hire, one clerk at the rate of \$1,800 a year and one at the rate of \$1,500, they give some consideration to cutting down the number of clerks Senators should have who come from States where the population is small. For instance, there are 15 States with populations of less than 1,000,000, 8 States with populations of less than 500,000, and 3 States with populations of less than 300,000. There are two Senators from each of those States. It does seem to me that the Senators have more clerks than they need for the conduct of their business, and it does seem that the Senate should use good business judgment and try to hold down the number of additional clerks. This bill will add over 600 more clerks on Capitol Hill. I hope the conferees will convey that message to the Senate and see if they cannot cut down expenses to the degree warranted by good common business sense. I am personally against the bill because of its waste and extravagance, and I feel it is not necessary and should not be passed.

Mr. WARREN. If this bill goes to conference, I assure the gentleman I will present his views to the conference committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position clear on this matter. I am opposed to the legislation that is proposed. I voted against it when it was here in the House in the first instance. I realize that to send measures to conference is the normal way to do business and I am, therefore, not going to be obstinate and object to sending this bill to conference. However, I wanted to make my own position clear.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. WARREN, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. WOLFENDEN.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the brief address and tribute paid to the State of West Virginia by my constituent, Col. Heber H. Rice, of Huntington, W. Va., upon the State's seventy-sixth anniversary celebration at the New York World's Fair on June 24, 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the N. Y. A. Administrator, Mr. Williams, at the Institute of Public Affairs in Virginia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Senate passed the so-called Connally amendment to the social-security bill, requiring the Federal Government to match \$2 for each dollar the State contributes up to \$15 for the aged needy. This is one of the amendments a group of us fought for so hard and unsuccessfully when this bill was considered on the floor of the House. Since the Senate has seen fit to place that amendment in this bill, it is hoped that the House will see fit to concur in the amendment. It is right, it is just, it is fair, and it is equitable. I hope the conferees on the part of the House, backed by the House membership, will see fit to allow this amendment to remain in the bill and become part of the law.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I am sorry to say to my friend that my time is just about up.

Mr. RICH. No; it is not up. Where are you going to get the money to do that? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. COLMER. Where we get it for everything else.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, referring to the remarks of my distinguished colleague, and on the same general subject, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], I would like to call the attention of the House to a newspaper dispatch of July 11, from Fargo, N. Dak., reading as follows:

Early returns from today's special election indicated a strong vote against passage of the four measures sponsored by former Gov. William Langer in a move to pay for the \$40 (per month) minimum old-age pension plan he helped push through the recent legislature.

On a gross income tax or transactions tax 588 precincts gave 9,481 yes and 66,886 no.

This illustrates that when it comes home to the people that they must pay these bills they vote the other way. It proves that they will sustain their representatives if those representatives will save the taxpayers' money. [Applause.]

#### MEMORIAL CONCERT FOR THE BENEFIT OF FAMILIES OF VICTIMS OF THE "SQUALUS" DISASTER

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6942) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at a memorial concert for the benefit of the families of the victims of the U. S. submarine *Squalus* disaster at Rye, N. H., July 30, 1939, and for other purposes, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and participate in a memorial concert to be held at Rye, N. H., on July 30, 1939, the entire net proceeds of such memorial concert to be distributed to the families of the men who lost their lives in the sinking of the submarine *Squalus*.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of defraying expenses of such band in attending and participating at such memorial concert there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$3,100, or so much thereof



as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That in addition to transportation and Pullman accommodations the leaders and members of the Marine Band be allowed not to exceed \$5 per day each for actual living expenses while on this duty, and that the payment of such expenses shall be in addition to the pay and allowances to which they would be entitled while serving at their permanent station.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Change the period at the end of section 1 to a colon and add the following proviso: "Provided, That the cost of the travel herein authorized shall be charged to current appropriations of the Marine Corps in the same manner and under the same regulations as though such travel was necessary in the Naval Service."

Strike out all of section 2.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. JENKS] may address the House for 5 minutes and I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, last, one of the most appalling disasters in the history of our Navy took place off the coast of New Hampshire. We all recall the shock and alarm with which news was received that the submarine *Squalus* had failed to rise from a practice dive; we remember the hours of prayerful hope and suspense that followed, and the wave of joy and gratitude that swept over the Nation when word was flashed that the men entombed 240 feet below the surface of the Atlantic Ocean were being brought to the surface. But there was still another chapter to be written—that joy and gratitude was later tinged with sorrow when it became known that 26 of the men of that brave crew were trapped, beyond the hope of rescue, in their watery grave. I shall not dwell on the sorrow that has since hung like a pall over the loved ones of those 26 men.

Word came to me a few minutes ago from Portsmouth that they have just begun to raise the *Squalus*, and there is every reason to hope that the effort to bring the vessel to the surface will be successful.

This bill, H. R. 6942, that I have introduced and that you have consented to consider is for the purpose of authorizing the United States Marine Band to go to Rye, N. H., to participate in a memorial concert on July 30 for the benefit of the dependents of those men who are still in that water-filled compartment of the submarine *Squalus*.

I feel confident that every Member of this House is interested and in sympathy with this bill because the loss of those men is a national disaster and the welfare of their dependents is a national responsibility. The States which suffered specifically in this calamity can be listed as follows: Arkansas lost one, California three, Connecticut two, Florida one, Georgia one, Idaho one, Iowa one, Massachusetts one, Michigan one, Minnesota one, Missouri one, New Hampshire two, New York one, Oklahoma two, Pennsylvania one, South Carolina one, Tennessee two, Virginia one, and Wisconsin one.

I talked this morning with those who are sponsoring this memorial concert; from subscriptions already received, it is estimated that the net proceeds of the concert will be in the vicinity of \$30,000, which indicates that a most generous response will be forthcoming from all sections of the country. The plan is to broadcast this concert over the National and Columbia networks, and I feel sure that the appeal to be made in connection therewith will meet with overwhelming success.

I would appreciate very much the Members of this House doing the unusual thing of authorizing the President to send the Marine Band to New Hampshire for this occasion; I realize it is not customary for Congress to send the Marine Band other than to the two national conventions of our Nation-wide veterans' organizations, but in behalf of the dependents of the courageous men who lost their lives in line of duty on the submarine *Squalus*, I bespeak your favorable consideration of this bill.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Yes.

Mr. THORKELSON. Does not the gentleman believe it would be a good idea for the Members of Congress to donate \$5 apiece to the families of these men?

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. I thank the gentleman from Montana, and I am in hearty and thorough accord with his suggestion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article in the Survey Graphic for July 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### FORT STEVENS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, 75 years ago yesterday occurred an incident in the District of Columbia that is unique in the history of our country for two reasons. It found a President of the United States—Abraham Lincoln—in office under fire and, secondly, the only engagement ever fought in the District of Columbia took place. It was an attempt upon the part of a daring, brilliant Confederate general, Jubal A. Early, to capture the city of Washington, July 12, 1864. The Battle of Fort Stevens occurred. Yesterday was the seventy-fifth anniversary of that event. Last evening a very short but a very appropriate exercise was held in the fort to commemorate that event, and our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES] delivered a brief and an appropriate address on that occasion. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include the address of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES] delivered on that occasion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by the Honorable Benjamin Rosenbloom, a former Member of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a radio address delivered by the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], Monday last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief patriotic address delivered by Rabbi Max B. Currick, of Erie, Pa., president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, on Abraham Lincoln.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### SHOOTING AT HARLAN, KY.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

## DEATH FOLLOWS DENIAL OF CIVIL LIBERTIES

Dock Caldwell, 31-year-old miner, lies dead in Harlan County. He died because he attempted to follow the decree of John L. Lewis that no one in Harlan County should work until he had joined the United Mine Workers of America.

Last Sunday William Turnblazer, head of the local union, called upon those belonging to the United Mine Workers to prevent the operation of the mines. Yesterday morning Caldwell attempted to carry out Turnblazer's demands, to make good the decree of John L. Lewis, by trying to prevent a fellow worker who did not belong to the union entering a mine. He was shot and killed. Two National Guard men were seriously wounded. Three other miners were wounded in the same affray.

For months the National Labor Relations Board, headed by its Chairman, Madden, has been giving support to the idea that in Harlan County a man must join the United Mine Workers before he can mine coal. Acting in collusion with William Turnblazer, head of the local union, Philip Phillips, a regional director of the Board, has been giving support to the move which denies civil liberties to the miners of Harlan County. The Federal administration itself has lent moral encouragement to John L. Lewis' demand for a closed-shop contract in the soft-coal industry.

Upon the shoulders of Lewis, whose commands in 1922 were followed by the massacre of 25 miners at Herrin, Ill., in a similar dispute, rests the major share of the responsibility for the death of Dock Caldwell. Sharing in that responsibility should be listed Madden, of the National Labor Relations Board, the members of that Board, and William Turnblazer, who incited the unlawful activities of the pickets.

The time has long gone by when we as representatives of our people should by our silence, by our inaction, lend moral support to those who deny liberty to our fellow citizens. On the floor of this House for amendment should be brought the National Labor Relations Act, so that American workers may once more be free to follow their chosen tasks to earn a livelihood for themselves and their families.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a radio address broadcast by myself July 1.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Baldrige, one of its Clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 329. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 289. An act for the relief of the West Virginia Co.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Secretary be directed to request the House to return to the Senate the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 155) entitled "Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas."

## FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT LIBRARY

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up privileged House Resolution 238, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

## House Resolution 238

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 118, a joint resolution to provide for the establishment and maintenance of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed

2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Library, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this matter has been debated heretofore, and that a majority voted for the resolution when under consideration the last time, I am wondering whether the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] would agree that we reduce the time for the rule to 15 minutes on a side.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, when this matter last came before the House it came up suddenly, and we were not in position to discuss it in detail. Actually we need more time in order to convince those on the Democratic side that there should be no such memorial library at Hyde Park.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I feel that if the gentleman would have from now until doom's day he would not have enough time to convince Democrats or any man interested in this matter to vote with him.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this resolution makes in order Senate Joint Resolution 118. It provides for 2 hours of general debate. I was hopeful that the gentleman from New York would agree to 15 minutes for each side on the rule, but for his own reasons he again desires to be heard at length.

I personally feel that the resolution should be adopted without extensive debate. When it was up a few weeks ago 229 Members voted for it and only 139 against it, which was but a few votes short of the required two-thirds under suspension of the rules. Since that time the press, including even the reactionary Republican newspapers, have editorially condemned those who voted against the measure without regard for merit but simply as an expression of petty and mean politics. Now we are considering the measure again. Politics has had its day on the matter, and this is the time to look upon it without prejudice. In my opinion every Member, regardless of party, should in good conscience vote for it. I had expected that the Republican Members on the left, after considering the criticism of their votes against this resolution when it was last up, would realize their mistake, agree to unanimous consent for the bill to be called up without special rule, and then concur in having the bill read and passed. But somehow or other you pay little heed even to honest criticism that you sometimes find in your own papers.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I cannot yield. You are pursuing a policy which does not help the Nation, yourselves, or your party. Mr. Speaker, I regret that some of my old Republican friends, for whom I have a good deal of respect and affection, of late have been obliged to vote under orders. Some years ago we Democrats were charged with being rubber stamps, although it is now admitted that we always retained our independence of thought and action. That charge may now be thrown back at the Republicans. I know that the Democrats always tried to support the President in his great efforts to pull us out of a terrible depression brought on by a Republican administration, and at the start you Republicans seemed to possess enough sincerity to aid us.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I cannot yield to the gentleman now. But of late you seem to vote as a unit at all times, under the whip and spur of the minority leader, for whom personally I have the highest regard. I am actually sorry for him, because the orders do not come from him, I know, because he is a legislator. He desires to do the right thing, but these orders come from the old, defunct, and, as I believe, extinct Republican National Committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?



Mr. SABATH. To the minority leader I am always pleased to yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman tries to be honest and fair and always is when he has the real facts.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to tell the gentleman that I am not taking orders from anyone, but I wonder if he can say the same? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SABATH. I can. I want to say to the gentleman who has served with me many years that I have at all times been more or less independent.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. More or less? [Laughter.]

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mostly less.

Mr. SABATH. I cannot say that of many of your Members. It might surprise you to know that I am a Democrat and when, especially during the last 6 years, we have been trying to bring out legislation for the benefit of the country, that it is but natural for me to support those beneficial measures which have accomplished so much for the country. I hope, however, that you will realize that the policy you Republicans have pursued of late will not aid you in the long run. It cannot gain you support, for the people are not slow to recognize instances of playing politics at the expense of the country. And this is a typical example.

Many of you were elected because of your promises to forego politics and to work for the interest of the people, but if you expect to be reelected you had better change the tactics you are now pursuing not only on this measure but on all others this session. People are becoming convinced that you are not keeping the faith with them. All you seem to have on your brains—pardon me, I meant to say on your minds—is politics, making a political issue out of this resolution before us. You thought you were doing a smart thing for the Republican Party when you voted solidly to reduce the wages of W. P. A. workers in the East, North, and West, and to increase the wages of those in the South, and likewise throwing thousands off of W. P. A. jobs, even though they cannot find employment in private industry. I wonder how you will explain that vote to your constituents at home. I believe that they will resent it and will charge you of betraying them for a little political advantage. Do not let your unwise political strategy run away with you, because it will rebound on you next election and leave you at home.

If the resolution before us were considered solely upon its merits, without regard to politics, we would not be obliged to spend 3 or 4 hours in debate. Here we have a situation where the President of the United States signifies his intention of turning over to the Nation, free of charge, all his valuable papers, correspondence, and documents. Former collections of Presidents had to be purchased at great cost.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. In a few minutes.

Mr. FISH. I would like to know what President received any money for his papers.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, the gentleman from New York is so well informed that it is not necessary for me to waste time in enlightening him. From the records he can find out how many Presidents—

Mr. FISH. I do not know of any President who received any money.

Mr. SABATH. Not the President himself.

Mr. FISH. Well, that is what the gentleman said.

Mr. SABATH. Some of the widows of Presidents, and some of the Presidents, too, for their writings, just as President Coolidge did at a dollar a word. And you all know what happened to President Harding, but I do not want to go into all that. I am taking the floor today in the hope that I might convince some of you that your course is a poor one, one that you should abandon. For your own benefit you should cooperate with us, help us legislate properly, and pass legislation helpful to the country, and make it possible to adjourn soon. Such a course would bring you the applause of the people

instead of the criticism you now reap. Such a course would be praised as sincere and constructive legislating, instead of playing politics.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I cannot yield to the gentleman. He cannot enlighten me.

Mr. BOLLES. Oh, yes; I can.

Mr. SABATH. Not on any subject I wish to take up. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to detain the membership further. I had jotted down a few memoranda to call to the attention of the House, but I do not think my advice would be heeded. In calling a few facts to the notice of the Republicans I have done my duty. If they will not heed my advice, it will be their funeral, and no one else's.

There is one charge that will be made today, I am sure, that I do want to answer. Branding this as a memorial in an attempt to prejudice Members against the resolution, the lame criticism will be made that memorials should only be for the dead, a narrow viewpoint to which I cannot subscribe. I believe that Congress should give its approval and applause to those who deserve it during their lifetime rather than to withhold it until the individual is dead.

However, this is not simply a memorial or a monument. It is a means of preserving for the American people documents and other material of value to future generations from a historical standpoint. President Roosevelt needs no monuments or memorials now or in the future. Posterity remembers a man for his deeds, and President Roosevelt has built a memorial in the hearts of the American people more enduring than stone or concrete. A great man may be condemned and even vilified during his lifetime, as were George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, and Abraham Lincoln. But when the years roll by and history views them in true perspective, they have taken their place with the immortals of all time, while their critics have long since been forgotten. So it is with President Roosevelt. There are many who try to block his noble endeavors, who use as their mean instrument the most sordid and petty politics. Their reward is a headline in today's newspaper. History will accord them obscurity.

I say to you that the deeds and efforts of President Roosevelt in behalf of the underprivileged, the downtrodden, the unemployed, and the masses of the American people will live long after the criticism and opposition of selfish interests are forgotten, just as the men who make them today will be forgotten.

Neither I nor any supporter of the principles of President Roosevelt needs to stand here and ask you to erect a memorial to him. The American people will take care of that. But we do ask you, in the interest of the American people and of future generations, to help us preserve those things of historical interest and value through the creation of this library.

You all know how many times, after our Presidents have gone, that private collectors ask exorbitant sums for documents, letters, manuscripts, and so forth that have fallen into their hands and that later Congress has desired to acquire for preservation. In my many years of service here I have been called upon many times to vote on bills, as have many others here, to appropriate large sums to buy records and other private papers of former Presidents, both Republican and Democrat, from private sources.

Here in this measure is an opportunity to acquire these valuable records while the owner of them still controls their disposal, thus saving the people future expense and preserving them for the future. Laying aside all petty political considerations, the passage of this measure is not only a practical but the patriotic thing to do, and I hope that even the most partisan Member will today rise above politics and vote for the passage of the measure.

I will conclude by saying that I hope that between now and the time debate on the resolution expires you gentlemen will give it serious thought and vote with us in passing it.

Some of you Members on the Republican side and even some Democrats at times feel it is wrong to say a good word

about a good man during his lifetime. I do not agree with you. I believe in expressing appreciation while a man lives. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York 30 minutes, as he has requested.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. What does the gentleman think about this situation: That if the documents are of real value historically to the country, they should be placed in a public library where they would be easily accessible, a library like the Congressional Library, or some big library in New York City, rather than being entombed and embalmed in some small place?

Mr. FISH. I may say to the gentleman from New York that that is the only issue before the House. These papers belong in only one place; not, as my colleague said, possibly in the Library of Congress, or some other library in New York City; they belong in the Congressional Library, beyond a possibility of doubt, and in no other place. They should be in the Congressional Library along with the papers of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and of all our Presidents down to the present time. As I proceed I will present the records regarding the papers of the different Presidents and the facts in detail.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is this the most important legislation that the new dealers have to present to Congress? Is this going to solve the unemployment problem and put 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 idle men back to work?

Mr. FISH. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota that I regret exceedingly that this bill is brought up, because I am fearful it will be adopted by a party vote and that a very deplorable and an unfortunate precedent will thereby be established. No bill should be brought before this House for the erection of a monument to a living man, especially a bill to provide by a vote of Congress for the maintenance of a public library away from the city of Washington to contain the papers of any President of the United States, be he Republican or be he Democrat.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman says it is improper and without precedent to establish a memorial like this to a living man. Would it not be all right when the man is dead politically?

Mr. FISH. I have to admit to the gentleman from Minnesota that I think that behind this bill is a certain nervousness on the part of the President and his friends, that they are not willing like other Presidents and their friends to wait upon the verdict of history to decide what place that President should have; and, therefore, now, during his lifetime, it is proposed to erect a library to him and have Congress maintain it and not await the verdict of history. No one in this House knows whether President Roosevelt will go down with Jefferson, Jackson, Cleveland, and Woodrow Wilson, those great Democratic Presidents, or whether he will go down in history with Pierce and Buchanan. I will have a little more to say on that later on. As Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record."

My friend from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] spoke here for 15 or 20 minutes in a most amiable way, but he did not enunciate a single sound argument or reason why the Federal Government should maintain this library at Hyde Park. Let me say to the membership that if there should be one man—and I do not believe there would be half a dozen votes for this bill if the vote were taken secretly so the administration would not know how the Members voted; there is no rhyme or reason for it while there are scores of reasons against it—but if there is any one man who should be for it, it is myself, because this library is to be erected in my congressional district.

The building is to be maintained by the Congress and by the Government in my congressional district. I have been bitterly attacked by the two largest newspapers in my district published in the city of Poughkeepsie, 3 miles from Hyde Park, for my views upon this subject. They came out in two or three different editorials denouncing me and urging my constituents in Hyde Park and Dutchess County to appeal to me, to write to me to change my views when this bill came up for reconsideration. As a result of these editorials in the two largest newspapers in my district I have received one letter from a proponent of the bill, some professor at Vassar College, one letter from the Roosevelt Home Town Club, or whatever they call it, in Hyde Park, one letter from the town board of Hyde Park, and a dozen letters against the bill.

That is all I have had from my congressional district, in spite of this tremendous appeal that has been made to my constituents to write and tell me I was wrong.

There is no better or finer town in the whole of the United States than Hyde Park. It is a great Republican town, and, naturally, many of the people of that town want this library. They want it maintained by the Government. Public subscriptions will be raised, or have already been raised in the amount of \$350,000. The building will be built there, I hope, by local labor. Then it is proposed that the Congress appropriate funds to maintain it, but no one has told us how much that will be. It may be \$40,000 or \$50,000, and I have heard it estimated as much as \$100,000 a year. I propose to offer an amendment to limit it to \$12,000 when the bill is read for amendment.

Of course, the people of Hyde Park would like to have this library. They would like to build it themselves with their own labor. They would like to have a dozen or more jobs in the library, and I have heard it claimed there would be as many as 40 jobs.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. Was the President born there?

Mr. FISH. Yes; the President was born in Hyde Park, and he has lived there all his life, but rarely has he ever carried the town of Hyde Park. Of course, that is another matter.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. May I ask the gentleman if he does not think it would have been well if the precedent that is now about to be established, if this legislation passes, should have gone back to the days of George Washington and other Presidents, irrespective of who they may have been, and if each of those Presidents had donated his home, his birthplace, his papers, and would have constructed buildings as is here proposed, and would have then presented to the American people such property, it would now be a great shrine?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is under some misunderstanding. The President is giving the Government, like practically all other Presidents, certain papers which ought to belong to the Government anyhow. Secondly, he is not giving the library, he is merely giving 12 acres of his land, which becomes tax exempt. The people of Hyde Park will have to pay for those taxes because those 12 acres automatically become tax exempt. He himself is giving his papers, and, I submit, and will prove as I go along, that those papers ought to be in the Library of Congress with the papers of all of our Democratic and Republican Presidents. We have a Congressional Library for which we appropriate huge sums of money. It has special archives called "Presidential Row." It has trained and skilled men in the manuscript division who study these Presidential papers and who are experts on those periods of history. People come from all over America to the Congressional Library to study the Presidential papers, not those of one particular President but of all Presidents. If you pass this bill you establish, in my opinion, a highly undemocratic precedent. I actually believe it an un-American, undemocratic, and unpatriotic precedent. I cannot imagine anything that is more undemocratic than Congress voting to



encourage Presidential papers being taken away from the city of Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. I want to answer the statement just made, if the gentleman will give me an opportunity, to see whether I am in error or not.

Mr. FISH. Then ask a question.

Mr. LEAVY. My understanding is that the plain provisions of this resolution provide that the President at his own expense will erect upon these 12 acres of ground such building as is required and will reimburse the Government for any services it renders in designing a building; then will donate the building with, not his public papers, but his private papers that belong to him and to his heirs, and these will be made available to the American people. It is that situation that I ask about.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is in error. The President puts no money into that building. It has been raised by public subscription amounting to \$350,000.

Mr. LEAVY. Does the gentleman contend this legislation provides that the money shall be raised by public subscription?

Mr. FISH. Certainly. It has already been raised.

Mr. LEAVY. There is nothing in here to so indicate.

Mr. FISH. We have nothing to do with that. We are to maintain the library after it is built.

Mr. LEAVY. I am frank to say to the gentleman, if the Herbert Hoover birthplace in Iowa were offered under exactly the same conditions, I do not care whether it would be by public or private subscription, I as a Member on this side of the aisle would vote for it.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman does not even know what he is talking about. He has not read the whole bill. Furthermore, no Republican President would even think of asking in his lifetime to have the Government maintain a personal library in his home town.

Mr. LEAVY. I have read the bill.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman has made two or three misstatements. The President does not put a dollar into this library. The Government does not put a dollar into the building. That is raised by public subscription. We maintain the building in perpetuity and there is no limitation on the amount of money the Government may have to pay.

Mr. LEAVY. I challenge the gentleman to point out to the Members of the House where in this bill there is anything said that the money shall be raised either by public or private subscription.

Mr. FISH. I am telling the gentleman it has already been raised. The sum of \$350,000 has already been raised.

Mr. LEAVY. The gentleman very cleverly dodges the proposition I put to him.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman want to raise some more money? The bill, I have repeatedly explained to the gentleman, calls for no money to build a library.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman described our great Presidents. He admits that Franklin D. Roosevelt is a very great President?

Mr. FISH. I do not admit any such thing. Nor do I believe it. I am willing to let posterity determine that.

Mr. PARSONS. That is the way I understood the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. No. I personally believe he may go down as one of the greatest spendthrifts and one of the worst Presidents we have ever had, but let history determine that.

Mr. PARSONS. That is not in accordance with the language the gentleman used.

Mr. FISH. I said there was a certain nervousness on the part of President Roosevelt and his friends in regard to letting posterity determine where he will rank. He may rank with Jefferson, Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, and Jackson, those great Democrats; yet he may rank, as I said, with

Buchanan and Pierce and be forgotten, except for the burden he saddled on the American people.

Look at the record. What does the record disclose? It shows that practically all Presidential papers are now in the Library of Congress.

George Washington: All but a very small percentage of his papers and the letters known to have been written by or to Washington are in the Congressional Library in Washington.

John Adams: Very few of his papers are here. The papers of the Adams family are understood to be in the Massachusetts Historical Society under control of a family trust. The case of the Adams family is an exception, and I believe a great mistake has been made by the Adams family. There could not be a greater mistake than to have those papers under the control of the Adams family, when they should belong in the Congressional Library and be open to the public. I do not know whether the Adamses were Republicans or Democrats, and I do not care.

Thomas Jefferson: The large collection, including the Presidential papers, is here. A very considerable body, largely of personal character, is in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Why should they be there? They all ought to be in the Congressional Library.

Madison: The largest collection, including those which deal with the Constitutional Convention and with the Presidency, are here in the Congressional Library.

Monroe: The largest single collection is here. There are other groups, however.

J. Q. Adams: The situation regarding his papers is the same as in the case of John Adams.

Jackson: The great body of the Jackson papers is in the Congressional Library, although small groups are found elsewhere.

Van Buren: The great collection is here, including the Presidential papers.

Harrison: The main collection is here, and is small.

Tyler: The only collection in existence is in the Congressional Library.

Polk: The Polk papers, including the diary, are all in the Congressional Library.

Taylor: The only important collection, a small one, is in the Congressional Library.

Fillmore: A small group is here. The main collection is in the Buffalo Historical Society. It ought to be in the Congressional Library.

Pierce: The main collection is here, but there are others elsewhere.

Buchanan: A small group is here. The main collection is in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia.

This means that those who want to do research work and write about American history have to go to all these different places to find out the facts and to refer to the source material.

Lincoln: The Robert Todd Lincoln gift of the White House papers is here, but will not be opened until 1947. There are other groups elsewhere.

In reply to the gentleman from Illinois, I may say I do not know of any President who ever got a dollar for his papers. They have been largely donated to the Library or given by the widows to the Library, although I believe the Library has purchased some Presidential papers from private sources after their deaths.

Grant: There is no large collection.

Hayes: The main body of the Hayes papers is in the Hayes Memorial at Fremont, Ohio. The Government put up no money for that Fremont Library for Hayes, nor did the Government put up any money for any other library or other repository where Presidential papers may be kept.

This is a completely new precedent, establishing a memorial to a living man. It is utterly un-American, utterly undemocratic. It goes back to the days of the Pharaohs, who built their own images and their own obelisks. It goes back to the days of the Caesars, who put up monuments of themselves and crowned them with laurel leaves, and posed as gods.

Garfield: The papers of President Garfield are also in the Congressional Library.

Arthur: The main collection is in the Congressional Library, but in part is a deposit, not a gift.

Cleveland, a great Democrat: The great collection is here in the Congressional Library. There are other small groups elsewhere.

Benjamin Harrison: The Harrison papers are in the Congressional Library.

McKinley: The great collection is here. It covers the Presidency, particularly.

Theodore Roosevelt: The Theodore Roosevelt papers are in the Congressional Library.

The papers of President Taft are here, but as a deposit, not as a gift. Does anybody believe the Taft family would ever take a penny for those papers? If they do believe it, they do not know the Taft family.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Why does not the Taft family donate the papers?

Mr. FISH. The reason they do not donate the papers is simply this: Many of the Presidents and many of the Secretaries of States, too—and I hope I have time to refer to the Secretaries of State because their papers are also in the Congressional Library—do not want their papers opened immediately. As in the case of the Lincoln papers, Mr. Lincoln's son did not want President Lincoln's papers opened, for personal reasons, until 1948. The Taft family may have personal reasons for not donating the papers at the present time.

A year ago I myself donated to the Congressional Library 30 boxes or trunkloads of papers of my grandfather, Hamilton Fish, who was a United States Senator, a Member of the House of Representatives, and Governor of the State of New York, and for 8 years Secretary of State under the Grant administration. This was probably the greatest collection of official papers and letters that is in existence. It includes letters from numerous Presidents, as well as letters from Clay, Calhoun, and Webster, and from Charles Sumner by the score. These papers are of much more real value than the papers of President Roosevelt today because such papers do not have much value until the men have been dead for a number of years and a sales value is developed. I donated these papers because they ought to be in the Congressional Library. However, my grandfather in his will expressed the desire that his papers be not donated immediately because of a personal row with Sumner. He did not want them released to the public for a number of years after the death of those referred to.

Let me go on. Most of the Presidential papers have been donated with just a few exceptions.

Wilson: Certain letters and papers of President Wilson are deposited here, but are not open to investigators.

Harding: The Library has a few letters written by President Harding, but the Harding papers are understood to be in the Harding Memorial at Marion, Ohio.

It is my belief there are very few papers left in the Harding collection. I am under the impression most of them were destroyed, because I have tried for years to get one single letter written by President Harding and signed by President Harding, and I have been unable to do so. I wanted this for a collection of letters of all Presidents in the library at Williams College. They have a complete collection, except for a letter from President Harding. If anybody in the House or anywhere else knows where I can get a letter that President Harding has signed I would like to know about it in order to complete that great collection.

Coolidge: The papers of President Coolidge are here, but as a deposit and not as a gift. I understand that anybody who is studying the papers or the writings of President Coolidge, all he has to do is to ask Mrs. Coolidge, and she will let him see all the papers they may desire. That is the understanding in the Congressional Library.

President Hoover: The papers of President Hoover are at Palo Alto, at the university out in California.

I think they ought to be here with all the rest of the Presidential papers, but he has put them there at his own expense, while this proposal is to maintain the papers of President Roosevelt and establish this precedent, which means that every other President will come back to Congress for the same kind of appropriation for his home-town library.

Let us get rid of all this sob-sister stuff and shedding of crocodile tears, saying that we must erect a monument to a living man. If you do it for one, you do it for all, and that is why this precedent is wrong in every way.

If these Presidential papers are taken away from Washington and scattered in the future all over America, in Squeedunk and Podunk, writers, students, and those who do research work will have to spend thousands of dollars to go from one little town to another when we have already erected a Congressional Library at great cost in order to keep these Presidential papers. We have 20 men in the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress doing nothing else but looking after these historical papers of Presidents and Secretaries of State. In addition, there is a special photostat bureau with experts in charge. Now you come along and on political grounds, with no reason whatever advanced and with no argument except one of party, you say that we must do this for President Roosevelt, because he wants it done.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I agree with the gentleman that these papers should be deposited in the Library of Congress in Washington, so that they may be available to the statesmen of the future so that they may go there and go over these papers and learn how not to run a government. [Laughter.]

Mr. SABATH. Well, well, well!

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is a little difficult beginning this debate, but I do not think it makes any difference, because I imagine you have made up your minds and nothing I can say will deter you or change your decision. You will probably vote for this and say, "We cannot put these Presidential papers in The Archives Building. The Archives Building is already filled." This was stated in the debate the last time. I took the trouble to go down to The Archives Building a few days ago. It is one of the most magnificent buildings in Washington or anywhere else in the world. It cost \$12,000,000. It is about one-third filled and may not be filled for another 25 or 50 years, but, as a matter of fact, that argument which was presented to you as a reason for being for this bill the last time does not hold water. These Presidential papers do not go to the Archives Building, they go to the Congressional Library.

We have just built a new annex to the Congressional Library of 25 acres. They have enough room to hold Presidential and Secretary of State papers for hundreds of years to come, but you will hear the argument advanced that there is no place left for us to take care of these papers in either the Library of Congress or The Archives Building.

It has also been very noticeable, in some of the propaganda which has accompanied the proposal of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Inc., to have it taken over by the Government of the United States, that attacks and criticisms have been made on the Library of Congress and on other collections of papers of Presidents of the United States, the distinguished predecessors of the present incumbent of the White House. These attacks and criticisms, deprecating as they do previous work in the same field for the purpose of "building up" the Roosevelt proposal, are wholly unworthy, if not unpatriotic; for there can be no question in the mind of any fair-minded person that what the Government has already done by special acts of Congress or through its regular agencies, as the Library of Congress, has been proper and right.

Large expenditures are alleged to have been incurred. The present proposal asks for unprecedentedly large expenditures for the acquisition and care of one man's papers. Nobody knows what the appropriation will be in this bill. It may be \$50,000, it may be \$100,000. It may be the interest on several million dollars a year. I propose to offer



an amendment to limit it to \$12,000. I think that is ample for the maintenance of one man's papers outside of the city of Washington. I wish to God there was something that I could say to change one vote on the Democratic side. I know that I cannot. I know that we have all of the logic and reason on our side. I know that this Congress would not appropriate one thin dime for the maintenance of the Mellon Art Gallery if it were located in Pittsburgh, but when he gave his pictures and had them brought to the city of Washington, where they ought to be, then we appropriated money to maintain them here, and not where he was born, in the city of Pittsburgh. That argument will be brought up, that we have done something to maintain the Mellon Art Gallery, but he has given \$50,000,000 of his own money for pictures to promote Washington as an art center. This Roosevelt Library is not to be in the city of Washington. It is in my district, and if anybody should be for it, it is myself, but I shall never be for this library or for any private library for any President, Republican or Democratic, because it establishes a wrong precedent and it is totally undemocratic and totally un-American—taking these Presidential papers away from Washington where they could be seen, and where we have already got 20 men working on these official papers, paid by the Government of the United States. It is proposed now to set up a precedent for every President to follow from now on, to have a little library for his own personal papers, and then have our historians, rich and poor alike, chasing around after information all over the country. Is that democratic, or is this proposition democratic—raising a monument to a living man? Is that a sound precedent in America, where we still call ourselves a democratic nation?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. I do not understand the difference in a great monument to Mr. Mellon, who served through three Presidents, and erecting one to the greatest President.

Mr. FISH. Oh, the gentleman was not listening to what I said. I said that if that art gallery were erected in Pittsburgh, where Mr. Mellon was born, we would not give one thin dime out of the Treasury of the United States to maintain it; but when it is here and is a gift in the city of Washington, where we want it, then we do provide for it, and the gentleman probably voted for it. If we needed more manuscript room in the Presidential row of the Congressional Library, if they needed a couple more men, I would vote for it, although they already have 20 men there now. But to provide for 20 men for the Roosevelt papers in Hyde Park, some 250 miles from here, is an entirely different situation.

Mr. GREEN. Then think of the millions of dollars of taxes that were excused in the other case. There is nothing like that in this case.

Mr. FISH. Let me say to the gentleman, in the name of all the gods at once, upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed that he hath grown so great? What is good enough for Washington and Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln and Cleveland and Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt ought to be good enough for Franklin Delano Roosevelt, but apparently it is not. He comes in here asking special privilege of the Democrats, and the party whip is cracked, and without a sound reason or a sound argument you are told that you must vote for this thing and establish a precedent here that we maintain a library—a precedent for all time—and have these Presidential papers taken out of the city of Washington. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to take the floor again on a matter of this kind, because I expressed my true feelings rather fully a Monday or two ago when this matter was under consideration. After more than 26 years in this House I feel I know that if the majority party with any President—take the three Republican Presidents that party has

had in 12 of those years—had offered a bill exactly like this, with the name simply changed, that it would have met with little or no opposition on the Democratic side of the House. I feel that I know that. We did not hate Mr. Harding or Mr. Coolidge or Mr. Hoover. I never knew Mr. Harding personally. If I ever met him in my life, I do not remember it. I was sorry, deeply sorry, for the way some people in the United States of America treated Mr. Harding. I still believe, and I shall maintain as long as breath is in my body, that there has never been a President of the United States who was not an honest man.

I knew Mr. Coolidge fairly well. Frankly I liked him very much. I had breakfast with him one morning along with my friend from Massachusetts, and I remember their conversation about when they were in the Legislature of Massachusetts together, and some old hotel in which they lived, and so on. I had a good time with him. If a resolution such as this had been presented to have preserved the papers of Calvin Coolidge up at Northampton, I would have been proud to vote for it.

I knew Mr. Hoover for 8 years. He appeared before the committee of which I was a member, as Secretary of Commerce. I liked him. I thought he was a highly capable man as Secretary of Commerce. I never did think he would make a good President, and I think my fears on that subject were wholly justified by a complete demonstration of 4 years; but I did not dislike him.

I remember when Mr. Wilson was President. It is a rather funny thing. It does not apply to all Republicans. It never has. But there was a large percent of the Republican membership of this House that would turn pale, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] turns when he discusses Mr. Roosevelt, when they got up on this floor to talk about Woodrow Wilson. Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is a pretty good hater, you know. When Woodrow Wilson's name was mentioned they would turn pale. I never could understand just exactly why a certain percentage of Republicans should so hate a Democrat.

If another name were substituted in this resolution for that of Franklin D. Roosevelt, I doubt very seriously whether it would have a great deal of opposition on the Republican side of this House. I just do not think that my folks do that way.

Now, I am going to put in the RECORD, in my extension of remarks, a statement that was not prepared by me, but which I think is true, to show how the papers of the various Presidents are scattered throughout the length and breadth of the land. No President's papers are in any one place. A great many of them have been destroyed by fire. A few of them are in the Congressional Library. Some of them are in State historical societies. Some of them are still in the hands of individuals. The Lincoln papers will not be available for the public, as I understand it, until 1947.

These are Mr. Roosevelt's papers. These are his private papers. He has a right, when he leaves the White House, as he did when he left Albany and as he did when he left the Navy Department, to pick up any paper of any private nature and burn it or hide it away to be looked at 100 years from now. But Mr. Roosevelt wants these papers to be made available. To be frank about it, I think he is doing a beautiful and a generous thing. Was there any kick on our side of the House when there was a monument built down here and the land donated and the care and upkeep of it made a charge upon the Government from now on, when it was proposed that that memorial be set up in perpetuity to Andrew Mellon, who typified a certain class of business, a certain class of politics in the United States? You cannot separate it from being a monument to Mr. Mellon. And I was glad to support it. It is a remarkable thing that some people in this House, and especially the Representative from the district in which Mr. Roosevelt lives, get so disturbed when his name is mentioned. He is the most distinguished citizen who ever lived in that district, and probably the most distinguished who will live in it during the lifetime of any of us. If he has done one thing, if he has uttered a sentence in the more than 6 years

he has been President of the United States which pleased his Congressman, I have never heard him make a public statement to that effect.

Of course, he does not like Mr. Roosevelt. I do not know exactly how Mr. Roosevelt feels about him [laughter], but I can imagine, as I still have some imagination left in this material world in which I live. But I think it is most unfortunate. I believe that if the worst Republican I ever knew—and I have known some bad ones, just like I have known some bad Democrats—were President of the United States and lived in the district that I represent in Congress—I am not out of humor at all—if he lived in my district, I think I would allow somebody else at least to take up the personal cudgels against him. I would want the people to know that I represented a district that was proud of the fact that the President of the United States came from that district, just as Virginia used to be proud to be called the "Mother of Presidents," and like the great State of Ohio was proud that it came along following Virginia as the "Home of Presidents." Frankly, I would just be proud of it. I have tried to be proud of every President I have ever known and of everyone about whom I have read.

I want to say one thing to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish]: When he was talking about great Democrats and poor Democratic Presidents, if he will reread his history about the administration of James K. Polk, of Tennessee, he will probably revise his opinion of that great Tennessean, who was one time Speaker of this House, because I think he will find that in the administration of James K. Polk in all probability as many permanent and far-reaching things were done in Washington as in most other 4 years in the history of American politics.

I am sorry, as the gentleman from New York says he is, that this vote is going to divide up and down the center aisle; I am tremendously sorry for that. I think it is not going to be a fine spectacle in the House of Representatives. Every Democrat on the motion to suspend the rules voted to pass this bill. It is my presumption that everyone on the right of where I stand will vote the same way today; and I am deeply sorry, loving this place as I do, after an association here with such men as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, GEORGE DARROW, during all these years, sometimes sad but usually glorious, that you gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle from New York and from the other States should take the position you do.

Let me say to you that the press of the country is a pretty good interpreter of what will be written as history. They have not sustained you on your action of a few weeks ago, and they will not sustain you on the action you intend to take today, because they will believe as I believe, and as we all believe, that your vote today is being cast because Franklin D. Roosevelt is Franklin D. Roosevelt and because he is a Democratic President of the United States.

Let me say, furthermore, to this Congressman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish], that he need not fear about the place of Mr. Roosevelt in history. Mr. Roosevelt is like another great Democratic President of the United States who said:

It matters not what my personal fortunes may be, I am willing to play for the verdict of mankind.

[Applause.]

That man was Woodrow Wilson, loved and hated as few men have been since Jackson. If there was ever a man in the history of American politics who was hated it was Old Hickory Jackson, yet today when the roll is called of the great Presidents from Washington to Roosevelt no man leaves out the name of Andrew Jackson. [Applause.] He was hung in effigy more than any other President. He was cartooned with Arbuthnot and Armbruster hanging on either side of him, the great murderer. He was hated because he believed that brains and character should run this country, and not the bank of Philadelphia. [Applause.] Today, however, no man when he calls the roll of the great men who have been at the helm of this mighty state leaves out the farmer, gentleman, soldier, statesman, who today sleeps

on the ground of The Hermitage in the middle of that lovely State known as Tennessee. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the matter referred to as in my remarks is the following statement prepared by efficient people interested in the library bill:

Throughout American history Presidents retiring from office have removed from the White House all correspondence and documents addressed to them, because these papers and documents have always been considered personal property. After retirement some Chief Executives have totally destroyed such material; others have partially destroyed it, edited the remaining portion, and sold their collections; and still others have disposed of their papers in a manner making research and study of their collections impossible.

In order to acquire valuable Executive papers, Congress often has found it necessary to appropriate large sums for the acquisition of this material from Presidential heirs and individual collectors. In most cases purchased collections were incomplete, and from time to time additional sums must be spent to gain ownership of papers considered necessary to make existing collections more complete.

As an example of the present difficulties encountered by the historian who aspires to write a book concerning national development during the administration of President James Monroe, in order to utilize source material, it would be necessary for him to travel to such widely separated places as Washington, D. C., capitals of foreign nations, New York City, and private libraries in the United States and Europe.

It is the general impression that the papers of President Monroe are preserved in the Library of Congress, but the Gouverneur collection of Monroe papers is owned by a private citizen of Washington, D. C.; approximately 1,200 items are in the New York Public Library; unpublished notes written by Monroe when he was Ambassador to England to the Russian Ambassador to London were discovered in the Vorontsoff family library in 1935 and were to be published by the Academy of Sciences of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and other individual letters and documents are held by private collectors and libraries.

It is also a popular belief that the papers of Thomas Jefferson, whose library was given to the Government and constitutes the nucleus of the Library of Congress, are contained in the Library of Congress. It is true that the main collection is preserved in this manner, but his private papers are, for the most part, at the Massachusetts Historical Society Library; 186 letters to his daughter, Mrs. Martha Jefferson Randolph, are in the Pierpont Morgan Library; important papers covering the period from 1779 to 1835 are owned by the Pennsylvania Historical Society; for the period from 1788 to 1825, by the Buffalo Historical Society; for the period from 1789 to 1798, by the Virginia State Library; for the period from 1791 to 1835, by the Yale University Library; and other papers, for the period after 1791, are held by the American Philosophical Society and the Missouri Historical Society.

The same circumstances, applying in the cases of Jefferson and Monroe, are true with regard to 13 Presidents. The papers of nine Presidents are not available for research by reason of private ownership by heirs or explicit instructions that they are not to be opened until fixed periods of time have elapsed. The papers of six Presidents are thought to have been totally or partially destroyed by fire so that it will never be possible to assemble complete collections. Many collections held by the Library of Congress are fragmentary and of little value except as museum pieces. Since most of its large collections were acquired by purchase, the value of material not owned by the Library has increased, is eagerly sought by private collectors, and the completion of Government collections will be a costly process.

Many of the papers of Harrison, Tyler, Fillmore, Lincoln, Grant, and Harding are believed to have been burned. The Harrison papers still in existence are held by the Wisconsin Historical Society, the Library of Congress, and individual owners; the Tyler papers by the Library of Congress, but the greater part of his collection was left to his widow's care and was destroyed in the burning of Richmond in 1865; and the surviving Fillmore papers are owned by the Buffalo Historical Society and the Yale University Library. It is thought that most of Fillmore's papers were burned by his son's executors in 1891 in accordance with a mandate in the son's will.

The Lincoln papers in the possession of the Library of Congress will not be accessible until 1947, two other collections are owned by private citizens, and individual items are in the hands of collectors. Grant is said to have destroyed his own collection of papers and if any survive they are in the hands of various descendants or individuals. One of the most valuable books concerning the Grant administration—as a matter of fact, so significant that it won the Pulitzer prize for biography in 1937—was written by Dr. Allan Nevins, professor of American History at Columbia University, and was entitled "Hamilton Fish—The Inner History of the Grant Administration."

President Harding is popularly reported to have personally destroyed many papers pertaining to his administration, but the collection still in existence is in the possession of the Harding Memorial Association of Marion, Ohio.

The papers of President Coolidge are inaccessible to historians or the public and their eventual disposition appears to be a subject of uncertainty. President Buchanan's collection is held by the Pennsylvania Historical Society; Hayes' by the Hayes Memorial Library at Fremont, Ohio; and the papers of John Adams and John Quincy Adams are in the possession of the Adams family and are not available for research purposes.



President Herbert Hoover, probably conscious of the aid to research afforded by the separate preservation of source material along the lines of period and locality, constructed a library at Stanford University, California, known as the Hoover Library on War, Revolution, and Peace. There his valuable collection, including his personal library and important correspondence covering his many years of public service, is deposited.

Many of the Cleveland papers are privately owned, some are in the Library of Congress, and a sealed box of papers deposited in the New York State Library is to be opened this year. The collection of Woodrow Wilson is owned by Mrs. Wilson, and only Mr. Wilson's biographer has had access to it.

As the result of lack of uniformity in the methods of preserving Presidential papers, of the incomplete nature of even the largest collections, and of the scattered location of important papers which should have been preserved as a unit, it has not been possible for scholars, historians, and those interested in political science to properly analyze, for the benefit of government and history, the background and purposes of many important matters having their origin with the Chief Executives without extensive travel and large expenditures.

Some may argue that Presidential papers should automatically become the property of the United States Government; the same line of reasoning should apply to all duly elected representatives of the people. On this basis the correspondence, research material, and other information contained in the files of Members of Congress should become Government property when Members of Congress retire from office. Perhaps it is not necessary to cite the significance of speeches and letters by Webster, Clay, and other former Members of the legislative body in the formation and clarification of our democratic principles and policies. Like the papers of Presidents, the important collections of these individuals are located in cities and towns from boundary to boundary of the Nation, preserved by patriotic societies, libraries, and individuals. Presidential papers may be more comprehensive with respect to the activities of government, yet they are no more the property of the Government than the papers of any other elected or appointed individual discharging governmental responsibilities. Both practice and precedent have contributed to the theory that correspondence and documents of this kind are private property.

Since President Roosevelt's papers constitute the largest collection of Presidential papers in existence, and being mindful of the importance of preserving historically important material pertaining to the executive branch of the Government, the subject of their disposition was discussed with friends who suggested that he appropriately might seek the advice of historians and archivists, and a meeting with some of them was arranged for this purpose.

Many of those who were consulted by the President have stressed the importance of preserving intact all documents covering the years of President Roosevelt's public life, both in New York State and in the National Government. They have pointed out that all these papers overlap, that to separate them would destroy the unity which makes the collection unique among collections of executive papers, and that the only way to preserve this gift in the manner which will best facilitate all forms of research and study is to erect a separate building as a repository.

The historical material constituting the proposed gift of President Roosevelt may be briefly classified as follows:

First. Public and personal papers: These include practically all incoming and copies of practically all out-going correspondence, as well as other material covering his years of service as New York State senator, 1910-13; as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, 1913-20; as Governor of New York, 1929-33; and as President of the United States. They include also a large volume of political material, especially material relating to the Presidential campaigns of 1920, 1924, 1928, 1932, and 1936, and a smaller accumulation of other material of a miscellaneous character.

Second. Historical manuscripts, etc.: These consist chiefly of material relating to the history of the American Navy since 1775, which over a period of many years was collected from various sources. They include letters, log books, and other manuscripts, paintings, drawings, prints, and models of many famous American naval vessels.

Third. New York State material: This group includes a historically valuable collection of material relating to the State of New York and the Hudson Valley.

Fourth. Books and pamphlets: This collection numbers approximately 15,000 books and pamphlets. Some of them are rare items, many are autographed copies from the authors, and the great bulk of them are important works on American history.

A recent survey of the portion of the material that is now stored in Washington shows that the papers and books occupy between 5,000 and 6,000 linear feet of shelf space. Other items include over 400 pictures and prints of sizes varying from 12 by 18 inches to 36 by 48 inches, in addition to many smaller ones, 37 ship models, and approximately 7,000 volumes. At Albany there are approximately 50 boxes, size 2 by 2 by 2 feet, containing the personal and unofficial public papers of Mr. Roosevelt's two administrations as Governor of New York. There is also a considerable miscellaneous collection at Hyde Park, N. Y., which has not yet been surveyed.

Acting upon the advice of those whom he consulted, the President decided to give his private papers, documents, library, and pamphlets on subjects pertaining to historical events of this period, works of art, ship models, pictures, photographs, maps, and other similar material to the Government. A group of business leaders offered to cooperate with the scholars who suggested the plan for preserving the gift, by raising funds necessary to build a repository for the collection along lines to be determined

by leading archivists and historians and in keeping with the modern conception of library technique. The President then offered a tract of land from his estate at Hyde Park, N. Y., as a site for such a building. Public announcement of these gifts was made on December 10, 1938.

It should be noted that the proposed location of the library at Hyde Park, N. Y., is in keeping with the methods advocated by historians and authors engaged in research work related to history. Today there is so much source material, accumulated through more than 150 years of national development, that the mature years of a man's life would not constitute a period of sufficient length to permit the writing of a general history from original sources. Instead, scholars prepare new general histories by referring to outstanding books covering specific periods. In other words, the best book or books concerning the Revolutionary period, the Civil War period, and other periods, all written from source material, would be consulted. The new work would condense and consolidate the facts in the manner best suited to the purposes for which the new book might be written. In this way, revised, chronological data for public use covering the most important periods and events, can be presented in a single volume.

A scholar studying the economic development of the United States would utilize the work of individuals considered as outstanding authorities on economic development during each era of progress, authors of textbooks, and general nonfiction work pertaining to political science would follow the same method, and the principle applies in other associated fields of literature and history.

It is not difficult to understand why authors of histories and books on associated subjects, as well as works of fiction dealing with a certain period of history, prefer to have source material preserved on the basis of periods of national development. Naturally, the task of those engaged in research is facilitated by having the majority of source material pertaining to a given period, preserved at one location and administered by librarians and their assistants who, by reason of intimate knowledge of this material, can render the most effective service in advising and assisting authors.

Coupled with the desirability of segregating source material by periods of history, there is a further advantage to research in localizing source material whenever it is possible to do so without destroying the unity of a collection. "Localizing" may be defined as "establishing research centers in various localities where material holding definite local interest may be preserved." The historical societies of the Western States probably contain more informative material concerning the development of the West than is to be found elsewhere. This material is used in the preparation of State histories, but it is also important to the record of national growth since reference to it must be made in describing the national acquisition and development of the territory west of the Mississippi River. These libraries contain the collection of papers of individuals who contributed to the development of particular States as well as the important documents of Presidents of the United States and high ranking Government officials who were natives of the State and may have held State offices prior to their assumption of duties which were national in scope. Most of the other States, like those of the West, have State historical societies and State libraries where historical material is similarly preserved.

The result of the preservation of source material in this manner has been to stimulate interest in historical research throughout the country by affording ready accessibility to students and historians. It also has had the tendency to centralize material pertaining to locality and to individuals identified with the locality. Historians engaged in research work are primarily interested in a certain period of history, a definite locality, or a specific person. It would be financially impossible for authors with limited resources to visit Washington, D. C., for the purpose of devoting many weeks to intensive research. Under our present system it is possible for a complete history of the United States to be written without visiting the Library of Congress or the United States Archives. Books upon all phases of history have been written by qualified individuals from source material, and copies are contained in the larger libraries where they are available to all citizens.

In addition to conforming with the generally accepted principles of preserving historical material, it has been pointed out by authors that the location of the library at Hyde Park, N. Y., will make it possible for the President, upon his retirement, to render invaluable assistance in classifying material and in supplying information which might be helpful in clarifying the intent and purposes of documents. Archivists and librarians have cited the belief that decentralizing source material would decrease the hazard of fire or other calamity which under a policy of preservation at one point might result in a loss of the major portion of our important historical records.

Obviously it would be impossible and impractical to assemble all source material in the Library of Congress or the United States Archives. The administration of so much material would be cumbersome; suitable facilities for its preservation would be lacking; only a small percentage of individuals would be economically qualified to engage in historical research because of the expense of traveling to their National Capital; millions of school children who visit local libraries for study and inspiration in matters pertaining to patriotism and history would be deprived of the opportunity of viewing historic documents; and such a policy would be bitterly contested by public libraries, historical societies, and private citizens.

Several meetings were held by the various groups interested in the acceptance and preservation of President Roosevelt's gift, and as a result of these meetings the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Inc., was incorporated in the State of New York to carry out these purposes in the manner determined to be most beneficial both to the public and to historians. Committees were formed to direct the program that would make it possible for the Federal Government to accept the gift, and their activities are now under way.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. FISH. I just wanted to say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] that I agree thoroughly with his remark that Andrew Jackson was one of our great American Presidents, but that is all I agree to in the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SABATH. That is more than we expected from the gentleman.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 118 to provide for the establishment and maintenance of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 118, with Mr. BOEHNE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I see no reason for getting excited over the discussion of a matter of this character. It is, as the gentleman from New York well said, a very simple question. He reduced it, in his opinion—I refer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], of course—to one question only, and that is whether there is any other place that ought to be considered for the deposition of the papers of Franklin D. Roosevelt except in the Library of Congress. He then proceeded to make a number of misstatements—because apparently he has not had time to study this subject. I am going to correct his misstatements as I proceed in this discussion.

We find it necessary to take up the Senate bill instead of the House bill, because the Senate passed the bill ahead of us. In the meantime, the reorganization of the Government had been brought about, and this made it necessary to make certain perfecting amendments purely for the purpose of making the bill fit into the reorganization program. You will find, therefore, that on page 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 118 we had to change the title "Secretary of the Treasury" to "Federal Works Administration"; and we had to change "Treasury Department" to "Public Building Administration." To make the bill comport with the Government reorganization, on page 3, in line 4, we had to change "Procurement Division" to "Public Buildings Administration"; and, again, "Secretary of the Treasury" had to be changed to "Federal Works Administration." Further down on the same page, in line 19, the words "Provided further" had to be added to make the bill fit in with the general expression of the bill.

On page 7 we took out "Director of the National Park Service" and substituted for it "Commissioner of Public Buildings." This has been done, as I stated, for the purpose of making the bill fit in with the reorganization program that was brought about under a law passed by Congress. I want now to take up with you what this bill really is, what it provides, and then present the reasons supporting it.

You will find at the top of page 2 the following:

Title II of the joint resolution provides for the acceptance and maintenance of the library upon the following terms:

1. That the Archivist of the United States be authorized to accept for and in the name of the United States from the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, or from such person or persons as he may designate to act for him, a tract of land, consisting of approximately 12 acres to be carved out of the donor's estate in the town of Hyde Park, Dutchess County, State of New York, and located on the New York-Albany Post Road, to be utilized as a site for the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.

2. That the Archivist be authorized to permit the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Inc., a New York membership and nonprofit corporation, organized for that purpose, to construct on the said site by private subscription of funds a suitable library building or buildings, in accordance with plans and specifications to be approved by the Archivist, in which these collections of historical material and future additions thereto shall be housed.

I am reading this because I feel very few Members of the House have had an opportunity to study what really is in the bill. I am quite sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has not.

3. That, upon the completion of the above-mentioned project, the Archivist of the United States be authorized to accept from the donor the historical material described herein, and to acquire by gift, loan, or purchase, similar related material from other sources.

4. That the United States agrees to provide in the future such funds as may be necessary for the upkeep of the said library and for the administrative expenses and costs of operations thereof so that the said library shall at all times be properly maintained.

5. That a board of trustees be established, consisting of the Archivist, who shall be chairman, the Secretary of the Treasury, and five members to be appointed by the President of the United States. The trustees are to serve without compensation, but are to be allowed their necessary expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties. The board is authorized to accept, receive, and administer gifts and bequests of personal property as trust funds for the benefit of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, and to use such funds in the purchase of equipment for said library, in the preparation and publication of guides, inventories, calendars, and textual reproduction of material in the said library; and in the purchase of historical books related to and other historical material contemporary with and related to the historical material acquired from Mr. Roosevelt.

6. That the immediate custody and control of the said library (except as the same is vested by law in the Director of National Buildings, Parks, and Reservations) and its contents shall be vested in the Archivist of the United States, who shall be authorized to appoint and prescribe the duties of such officials and employees as may be necessary for the execution of the functions vested in him by law in connection with the said library.

7. That the Archivist be authorized to prescribe regulations governing the arrangement, custody, protection, and use of the material deposited in the said library and to make the material available to the public free of charge, except that he may, in his discretion, charge and collect a fee not to exceed 25 cents per person for the privilege of visiting and viewing the exhibit rooms and museum portions of the said library, and to pay the funds so derived into the trust fund above referred to in paragraph 5.

8. That the Archivist be required to make a report to Congress at the beginning of each regular session covering the operations of the said library, including a detailed statement of all accessions, dispositions, receipts, and expenditures for the preceding fiscal year.

9. That the cost incurred by the Archivist in carrying out his duties in connection with the said library be paid out of the appropriations to The National Archives Establishment as other costs and expenses of The National Archives Establishment are paid.

Mr. Chairman, there are plenty of copies of the bill available, and those who desire copies of the report may obtain them also, because they, too, are available. If you will follow the bill and the report you will be able to follow what I am about to say.

Beginning at the bottom of page 23 of the hearings you will find the following analysis of the bill by Prof. Samuel Eliot Morison, of the Harvard College Department of History, and it answers, in my judgment, practically everything that anybody wants to know, because I asked him to make it so plain that it could not be misunderstood.

In answering my letter he said:

The creation of a building where the archives and collections of a President of the United States are brought together for permanent preservation is a matter of far-reaching importance to historians and to American history. American history has suffered from the neglect of papers of past Presidents. Although many Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, and other papers have been secured by the Library of Congress, these are but a fragment of what they were when they left the Executive Mansion.

I want to emphasize that, because I want the Members of the House to understand the facts.

President Hoover is the only President of the United States so far who has preserved his archives and collections intact, and his building is at Palo Alto, Calif.



As I assume the committee is already familiar with the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library scheme, I shall write my memo in the form of answers to questions that some of the Members might wish to ask. I am speaking as a professor of American history, author of several books on the subject (list in Who's Who in America), and one who has done research on the papers of several Presidents.

Question. Why aren't President Roosevelt's Presidential papers sent to The National Archives after he retires from the Presidency instead of having a special building put up for them at Hyde Park?

Answer. Because a good deal more than his Presidential papers is involved. In addition to them, which The National Archives could receive, there are several other units in his collections which they aren't authorized to receive and have no place for, such as (a) New York gubernatorial and other New York political papers; (b) private library; (c) naval history manuscripts; (d) naval history prints and ship models; (e) various museum objects. The National Archives can handle only archives, not collections. The Library of Congress can handle only books and manuscript collections, not archives nor objects.

Question. Why shouldn't these be split up, the Presidential papers sent to The National Archives, books to the Congressional Library, others to the Smithsonian, New York Historical Society, etc.?

Answer. Because that would destroy the unity. All these collections and archives overlap more or less, as they have been accumulated by a President of the United States. In that respect they are unique. We have here the records of a Governor of New York, an Assistant Secretary of the Navy during the World War, a President for two terms, and, besides, the historical papers, books, and objects of a great collector. It would be a crime to break up this unique assemblage of historical sources and objects of personal interest, and the only way to keep it together is to erect a special library-archive-museum building to hold it.

Question. Won't history students find Hyde Park inconvenient and hard to get at, compared with Washington?

Answer. Hyde Park is certainly not so handy a place for students as Washington, but the inconvenience of the location will be more than compensated by the value, for future students of the life and administrations of Mr. Roosevelt, in having all the materials together. The sentimental value of having the library at Krum Elbow, Mr. Roosevelt's home, is also to be considered.

Question. Has the President the right to take his files away with him?

Answer. Yes. The White House has been cleared of every President's archives at the expiration of his term, or at his death, if he died in office; the files of his administration have been considered his personal property, to deal with as he or his heirs saw fit. And down to President Hoover's administration, the major part of the Presidential files were destroyed before leaving the White House.

Question. What have former Presidents, in fact, done with their papers?

Answer. Some (for example, U. S. Grant's) were totally destroyed by the ex-President, others (for example, Jefferson's, Madison's), after much editing and dilapidation, have been given or sold by the Presidents' heirs to the Library of Congress; others (for example, Lincoln's and Garfield's) have been kept fairly intact by the family, but not opened to investigators. Only the Hoover, Hayes, and Harding papers are housed in buildings specially constructed.

Question. Does not this removal of papers from Washington hamper the work of the Government departments?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is it not a fact that the Coolidge papers are in the Congressional Library?

Mr. KELLER. They are deposited there, but not as a gift. I will come to that and will cover the whole thing, if the gentleman will permit me.

Does not this removal of papers from Washington hamper the work of the Government departments?

Answer. No; because every incoming letter at the White House that concerns a Government department, or has to be dealt with by it in some way, is passed on to the proper department or official, and only a record or copy of it kept in the White House files. Consequently, anything in the Presidential archives that concerns official or other Government business exists either in original or in duplicate in the appropriate permanent depository at Washington.

Question. Why does the National Archivist come into this picture, when the F. D. Roosevelt papers are not to be in The National Archives?

Answer. It is proposed to place the Roosevelt archives and collections in charge of The National Archives Administration (a) in order that they may have expert care, handling, and classification from the day they leave the White House; (b) provide for access by competent historical students; (c) because The National Archives Administration is the most competent body in the country to handle the collection and the problems connected with them.

Question. Didn't former ex-Presidents take care of their own collections and papers?

Answer. Those who have cared for them with a proper sense of their obligation to posterity have found it a great burden. Mr. Hoover has been the only President with the means to give his collection proper care. He had but one term; Mr. Roosevelt will have had two. In Mr. Hoover's term about 600 pieces of mail came into the White House daily; the daily average has now risen to 6,000. The Rutherford B. Hayes Memorial Library at Fremont, Ohio, contains the equivalent to about 120,000 pages of typewriter paper.

There are already in the F. D. Roosevelt files at the White House between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 pages. In other words, the task of caring for a President's papers has now grown too big for any family to handle.

Question. Are there any other advantages to this plan?

Answer. The library and museum building will be erected by private subscription; Congress will only be asked to provide for maintenance as part of the National Archives Administration.

Respectfully submitted.

SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That document is signed by Mr. Morison?

Mr. KELLER. Certainly it is. It will be found on pages 23, 24, and 25 of the hearings.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The hearings before what committee?

Mr. KELLER. Before the House Committee on the Library.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Did Mr. Morison say anything about the Taft papers?

Mr. KELLER. We will find that here in another place.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Morison has already published in some newspaper the fact that the Taft papers have not been cared for. As a matter of fact, they are in the Congressional Library.

Mr. KELLER. We are going to find out about that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman said he would say something about the Coolidge papers.

Mr. KELLER. Yes; I did. And I will.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Coolidge papers are in the Congressional Library.

Mr. KELLER. Yes. That is true.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are open to inspection by anyone who wants to see them, with the permission of Mrs. Coolidge.

Mr. KELLER. Yes; with the permission of Mrs. Coolidge, but not otherwise. In other words, they are there as a deposit, not as a gift at all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman has no doubt that they will remain in the Congressional Library?

Mr. KELLER. There is no certainty at all that they will remain there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I just wanted to see that the history was complete, because neither the Taft nor the Coolidge papers are mentioned in this document.

Mr. KELLER. I am not through yet. That was simply to answer the question that had been asked generally.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman give me a little information on this?

Mr. KELLER. If the gentleman will ask a question, I will be glad to answer it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it proposed to include in this collection the private correspondence that might be of public interest?

Mr. KELLER. Certainly, everything. Let me read about that to the gentleman.

I do not yield any further, because other gentlemen may wish to ask questions for information—

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was asking for information.

Mr. KELLER. When the gentleman asks a question like that, it is not worthy of an answer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] made the statement that there is just one thing to consider, and that is whether these Presidential papers shall go into the library as the only place where they ought to go. The gentleman also said that the papers that are in the library have been given to the library. Of course, that is a mistake.

Let me call your attention to the fact that the Government of the United States has paid out for a part of the Washington collection \$45,000. We have paid for a part of the Jefferson collection \$20,000. We paid out for a part of the Madison collection \$55,000. We paid out for a part of the Monroe collection \$20,000, for the Jackson collection \$18,000, and for a small part of the Tyler collection we paid \$1,000. Some payment was made for a part of the Polk

collection, although the amount could not be found when I went to investigate it. What we have of the Johnson papers were bought by the Government for \$7,500, and some of the Chester A. Arthur papers for \$500. The total of this as far as we know at the present time amounts to \$167,000 paid out for only a small part, actually, of the Presidential papers of the United States.

The Lincoln papers are so thoroughly scattered that nobody knows what Lincoln wrote in many regards. There have been many things attributed to him which can neither be confirmed nor denied. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars is being asked for a collection that has been gathered together from all parts of this country over a number of years. I believe a bill was presented last year asking that amount for the known remainder of the Lincolniana.

It seems to me that when the gentleman refers to all these documents being given that is presented without cost, he ought to understand when we have already paid out \$167,000, and when we are asked to pay \$150,000 for some additional part of the Lincoln papers, that he ought not to make a statement like that. It is not true, and it is not only not true, it is entirely wrong.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield for a question.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has just called attention to the amount of money that has been expended for the papers of former Presidents.

Mr. KELLER. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not find anything in this report about it, and I may not have heard all the discussion, but can the gentleman estimate, approximately, what the expense of taking care of these papers may be to the United States Government? Are there any figures of record or do the hearings give us any information on that question?

Mr. KELLER. The question came up and there was no estimate before the committee that I know of.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I just wanted to know whether there was such an estimate.

Mr. KELLER. However, the question was discussed by members of the committee at different times both in the committee and out of it, as far as that is concerned. I should like to call attention to the fact that there is a provision in the bill that a fee of 25 cents is to be charged for admission to the grounds and to this museum, and so forth, and the proceeds from this fee are expected to cover largely the entire running expense. Also, if the gentleman will read the bill—and it is in the hearings, too, because I printed therein the bill and the incorporation of the nonprofit corporation to take charge of this library, as well as the bylaws of that corporation—you will find that all these facts are printed there. If you want to go into that question carefully, you will find that proper provision is made for receipt of other gifts that may be used for this very purpose. It is the belief of those who have looked into it best that it will pay its own way without making any charge for admission. That it will largely do so I myself have little, if any, doubt.

On the other hand, I call your attention to the fact that the question of cost of upkeep is brought in. With respect to all Presidential papers, whether they are simply deposited with the Government or whether they are owned by the Government through gift or purchase, the time of the employees of the Library of Congress is given to them. It is a part of the business of these employees to attend to the Taft papers, for instance, that can be seen only on permission of the Taft family. The same thing is true of the Coolidge papers. The same cost of personnel applies to the Lincoln papers, which cannot be seen at all until 1947. Nevertheless, we pay for the housing of those papers that do not belong to us. We pay for the cataloging of them. We pay for the protection of them, even when they do not belong to us. Since we are doing that, it is difficult for me to understand why anyone could rightfully object to paying the same character of expense in relation to an entire historic collection such as this is.

The Franklin D. Roosevelt gift to the American people, however, includes not only the Presidential papers but books,

correspondence, papers, pamphlets, works of art, models, pictures, photographs, plats, maps, and other similar material. A library of 15,000 or more volumes of rare books, many of them autographed by the authors and extremely valuable, is a part of this. The official papers, incoming correspondence, copies of replies, the brief memoranda—hand-written bits of only a sentence or two, but important in filling in the gaps in correspondence—stenographic records of telephone conversations, naval pictures, ship's models, and mementos of the Roosevelt era are all included.

This will give a comprehensive and complete history of this important period of history of America.

I want once more to call attention to the fact that a great proportion of the various Presidential papers are not in the Library of Congress.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And they will all be somewhere else, and not here in Washington, under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. KELLER. Oh, yes; certainly. I am just answering the contention of the gentleman from New York, and let me call your attention to the fact that only a part of the Washington papers are here, although a more nearly complete collection of his papers than any other are in the Congressional Library. Of the Jefferson papers, we have probably one-third of them. We paid \$20,000 for the part that was supposed to be the public papers, and the others went to the historic societies of Boston, and when they came to look them over they found many of the papers here are private papers, while many of those up at Boston are actually public papers. As to Jackson, there are some groups of Jackson papers all over the United States. Taylor only had a small part here in the Library of Congress.

As to Fillmore, practically none of his papers are here, nearly all being in the Buffalo Historical Society. The Buchanan papers are at Philadelphia. The Hayes Memorial at Fremont, Ohio, has the papers of Mr. Hayes. The Memorial at Marion has the papers of President Harding. I recall that my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] said these papers were at Squedunk and Podunk. I am going to report him to the citizens of Marion and Fremont and let him tell them which is Squedunk and which is Podunk.

Mr. Hoover's papers are all, I understand, at Palo Alto, and he has a perfect right to have them there.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] was just about as correct in his statement that all of these papers had been given to the Library of Congress as he was in nearly everything else he said, and not more so.

I also want to call attention to the fact that under the customs, at least, and under the law so far as we have enacted it, the papers do belong to the President and he has a perfect right to dispose of them to suit himself. But this is an attempt on the part of President Roosevelt to make it a custom in this country to always have the Presidents hereafter keep their papers intact for historic purposes, and that certainly ought to be done. Any man who has indulged in research along this line knows the importance of the statement I am here making. Every man who engages in an investigation of Presidential papers will find out how scattered and broken these collections are, how broken the historic thread is, and how difficult to pick up again. There is no perfect collection of the papers of any single President in the Library of Congress, not a solitary one.

I want to call attention to what my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] referred to. It was my very great pleasure and honor to introduce the bill, to hold hearings on it, and to sponsor through the House the bill that brought into existence the great National Gallery of Art, the gift of a great American. I also wish to call your attention to the fact that not a single, solitary vote was cast against that and not a single, solitary word said against the man who gave that great collection. In doing that he did honor to himself and to his country. I am proud of the fact it was my privilege to do that, just as I am proud today to bring in this new



idea, this very important idea of making available always hereafter to historians of our country the entire papers of every President who shall succeed Mr. Roosevelt. He appreciates as no other President has the great importance of historic continuity through official documents. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the junior member of the Committee on the Library, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROCKEFELLER].

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. Chairman, when I say I do not look with favor upon the proposals contained in this resolution, I do not speak with any personal or political bias, and any words I may utter are not to be interpreted to mean in any sense that I impugn the motives which may have prompted the sponsors of this resolution. As I understand it, generally and briefly, it is proposed to have erected not in the village of Hyde Park, but at some distance from it, at a point to be determined by the President, a building, or perhaps buildings in which are to be housed, preserved, and displayed such historic material as the President may donate.

Title I, section 1, subdivision (b) of the resolution states that the choice of materials shall include books, correspondence, papers, pamphlets, works of art, models, pictures, photographs, plats, maps, and other similar material, covering, I think we will all agree, quite a bit of territory. To properly round out the history of the United States I agree that it may be necessary or at least highly desirable to preserve and make available to those who wish to study them the important letters, papers, and other writings or printed documents of all of our Presidents and some of our high officials, but I do believe, and I believe it very strongly, that the material should be confined wholly to those documents, that have a direct bearing on our governmental affairs, or which will be of historic value now or as time advances. Although this resolution would seem to include them, I do not put in my category promiscuous works of art, models, pictures, photographs, maps, plats, and other miscellaneous subjects. I am firmly convinced that the cost of collecting, housing, and preserving and displaying unrelated exhibits of that nature would far exceed their true value, to either present or future generations. That value to my mind is not determined solely by the preservation and display of exhibits of that nature. I think the real test of their value is in the fact that they can and will be made easily accessible and available to those who care to inspect and examine them.

I am somewhat familiar with the country in the neighborhood of Hyde Park, perhaps more so than most of you. That estate is situated on the Hudson River, approximately 75 miles from the city of New York and about the same distance from Albany. Of course if one owns his own conveyance, he may come and go as he pleases and upon his own time, but if not, he will be compelled to avail himself of such autobus service or railroad service as is available. It is true that autobuses pass the entrance to the President's estate, but that service is very infrequent, and it may not be possible to induce the bus driver to deposit a passenger at any other place than the entrance to that estate, on the highway, in which case it would then be necessary for one to cover the rest of the journey on foot. Moreover, that meager bus service is very likely to be reduced within the near future for the reason that there is now under construction and will soon be completed another and better highway which is much farther from the present road and from the President's estate, and it is very likely that these buses will be rerouted as soon as the road is completed, over that better road.

As to railroad facilities, there is a station called Hyde Park, which is at least a mile or two from the entrance to the President's estate. Today the train service is very infrequent to that station. In fact, the timetable under which trains are operated shows that between 9 o'clock and 5 o'clock in the afternoon but one train out of New York City is scheduled to stop at that station on week days, with the exception of Saturday, when an extra train stops at 3:16 in the afternoon. That same timetable shows also that between those hours but one train out of Albany is scheduled

to stop at this station on week days. Anyone alighting from a train at that station would find it exceedingly difficult, if not quite impossible, to find a conveyance which would carry him over the rest of the trip, and it would, therefore, be necessary for him to cover that distance on foot.

The place nearest the President's estate where a traveler may procure food and lodging is in the comparatively small and unincorporated hamlet of Hyde Park, which is from 1 to 2 miles distant. I have passed through that hamlet many times, and to all appearances only those living accommodations are provided that will suffice the needs of those who reside in or near there. Travelers in any number would find it difficult to procure suitable meals and overnight accommodations.

Although one can at best but hazard a guess as to the number who may visit the buildings or of whom that number will be comprised, it is very likely that in the end visitors will not run into large numbers and will comprise very largely, if not wholly, students and writers of history and those engaged in research work of such a nature as to make inspection and examinations of the exhibits necessary. The inconvenience and expense of these visits may make it impossible for those people to avail themselves of such advantages as the library and museum may offer, therefore the principal purpose which might justify such an undertaking would be defeated.

Should the precedent be established, as this resolution will do, of permitting the important papers and writings of our Presidents to be housed and preserved at or near their homes, such a precedent would be highly undesirable and impractical. Under such a plan it would be necessary for those who may wish to examine and study the documents to travel from the Atlantic to the Pacific and to visit many intermediate places. The necessary expenses of those trips would undoubtedly be more than the average traveler could bear.

Today most of the important writings of many of our Presidents are housed, preserved, and made available for inspection and examination in the Library of Congress in the city of Washington. To that Library anyone interested may now go, without the payment of an admission fee, and examine those writings under most favorable conditions and with courteous and efficient service. That custom, in my judgment, should be continued, and any departure from it would be to the detriment of the work of those who are interested and would reduce materially the real value of those records. From a reading of the bill it might be inferred that the revenues from admission fees and other sources will be sufficient to pay all the expenses necessary to the maintenance of the museum, and that therefore the Federal Government will not be required to contribute any money toward its upkeep. My experiences with undertakings of this nature cause me to doubt very seriously that any such happy condition will obtain. I cannot dispel from my mind the thought that such an undertaking as is proposed by this resolution will, when all is said and done, require substantial appropriations out of the Federal Treasury. In these days of mounting deficits and debts it would be not only unwise but highly improper to impose this added burden upon the taxpayers. I doubt very seriously the propriety of adopting this resolution or of accepting the offers made thereunder, especially at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in today's issue of the Washington Daily News there appears a short editorial under the caption "Small Fry Politics," of which I shall read the first paragraph:

Certain Republican Members of Congress, led by Representative "HAM" FISH, of New York, are engaged in an almost incredibly petty attempt to defeat the bill to establish a Franklin Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park.

That political issue has been drawn in a number of the addresses that have been made on the floor, and I shall ad-

dress myself to it very briefly. When this bill was on the floor the first time, I voted against it. I found no great comfort in that vote, largely because it is so easy to misconstrue and interpret a vote like that on the ground that it has been inspired by narrow partisan politics.

I would support the bill that is before the House today if it told the whole story, but I am afraid that the issue has been confused, and that the issue of politics, if there be one, is one of those self-generated things over which we have no control and with which we on this side of the aisle have exactly nothing to do. All we have to do is to go back and examine the whole story.

It was in March of 1938 that the newspapers announced that a syndicate had purchased the Presidential papers and that they were to be put on the market at \$15.

There followed a swelling crescendo of criticism. It came from all sections of the country. We had nothing to do with it. We did not offer the papers to the public. We did not edit the versatile newspapers in the country that took exception to the propriety of the thing. After some 3 or 4 weeks there came from the White House a proposal to the effect that none of the royalties should enhance the fortunes of the present incumbent of the White House and that they were going to be devoted, and I use contemporary language, "to a worthy public purpose." On the heels of that statement came the proposal to establish a library at Hyde Park.

Now the bill is before us again to effectuate that purpose, to give the United States of America and the people thereof a remaining interest, subject to a life estate, in 12 acres until such time as it shall become complete. The costs are to be met by appropriations out of the Federal Treasury. There is no hint of royalties there. It is to be maintained by the Park Service, or the Commissioner of Buildings, under the Reorganization Act.

There is no hint of the expenditure of royalties there. There is a provision in the bill to charge a museum or exhibit fee that would rebut almost any contention that royalties are to be used. The construction is to be undertaken by a corporation in New York, ostensibly by private donations and otherwise, to take care of the building. There is no hint in the bill under the authority of the trustees that, in the bequests or gifts which they are to administer, any royalties are to be expended.

So what about the "worthy public purpose" of which the public in this country was given assurance, when there was a great tide of criticism because of the doubtful propriety of the incumbent of the White House selling these papers to a syndicate to be sold everywhere in the United States of America? We did not make the issue. Now, it would appear that some people are going to ask us to resolve it as a political issue, and I will say to you frankly that I am ready to do so unless they put something in the bill to require the assurance that was given by somebody at the other end of the Avenue in March of last year, when this whole project was inspired to lift the curse of criticism.

Now, here is a significant thing. They talk about politics. First of all, a committee of 60, a so-called ways and means committee, was organized in order to provide the money for construction. Who is the chairman of that committee? Mr. Frank Walker, and it is so stated in the report that goes with this bill. The language on page 3 of the report is:

There was organized under the chairmanship of Hon. Frank C. Walker a group of businessmen and other public-spirited citizens to help in raising funds for the construction of a library building at private rather than at public expense.

An examination of the reported activities of that committee is very interesting.

Let us see what happened out in the State of Colorado. I am quoting from a news dispatch from the Denver Post of July 4, 1939. The committee assigned a quota of \$2,000 to the State of Colorado as its share toward the construction of a building at Hyde Park. The job was entrusted to Mr. Thomas Duke, who is district administrator of the Bituminous Coal Act in Denver. Mr. Duke ostensibly is going to address himself to the job, and—

It is understood that all officeholders under the New Deal will be invited to contribute.

I am quoting from the dispatch.

Political? Partisan? Did we raise it? Are we using the Democratic national committeemen in order to raise the money? What would be the answer from that side with respect to that statement?

Another State, the State of Montana, has been given a quota, I understand, of \$2,000 to raise. I quote from this dispatch:

Mr. O. S. Worden, of Great Falls, Mont., who represents Walker's own State on the Democratic national committee, is reported to have threatened to resign when the \$2,000 assessment was levied on Montana for the Roosevelt Library.

Now, Mr. Worden's own remarks, in quotations:

"This is the last straw," he was quoted by friends here as declaring. "It is bad enough to meet repeated demands for the Democratic National Committee, but when it comes to soliciting money for the Roosevelt Memorial I am ready to quit."

But when they undertake to fasten upon us the allegation that we are playing politics, I wonder what answer can be made to the fact that two Democratic national committeemen are here quoted as saying that their States received quotas that must be raised and that they are getting tired of being used for that kind of purpose?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now we are called upon to appropriate out of the Federal Treasury under this bill for the costs incurred by the Archivist. We are called upon to appropriate out of the Federal Treasury for the expenses of the Board of Trustees. We are called upon to appropriate out of the Federal Treasury for the clerical help to the Board of Trustees. We are called upon to appropriate from the Federal Treasury, the people's money, for the maintenance, the care, and the upkeep of this memorial. It involves an overall expenditure of \$300,000 of public funds annually.

I have no objection. I am ready to vote for it, I will say to my friend the majority leader—I will give him a vote this afternoon if he will write into this bill a provision which carries out the solemn assurance that went out from the White House early in 1938 that the royalties from the sale of the President's papers will be devoted to a worthy public purpose which is now effectuated in the terms of the bill. I say to any of them that if they will write that into the bill and keep faith with the American people, I will give them a vote. [Applause.]

My attitude is not inspired by dislike or ill will. I entertain nothing but the kindest feeling toward the President. However, since the partisan issue was injected into the debate and it was made to appear that the attitude of the Republicans was predicated upon political bias and blind partisanship, it was only fair and proper to relate the whole story and show how this proposal came about and what assurance was given the country with respect to its operation and maintenance.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I think no one since I have been here in the House has ever heard me say an unkind word against President Roosevelt. I may disagree with some of his policies, but when it comes to a matter of preserving his papers for future generations, that is a different question. I join the gentleman from Illinois, who just preceded me, in saying that if this bill can be changed so that this building will be built here in the city of Washington where the people of the United States will get the benefit of it, then I will vote for the bill. This may be selfish on my part, but I feel that the place for this building is here in Washington where people who come by the thousands each year will have the opportunity of viewing these books and papers, and seeing what the present President of the United States has said and done. They cannot do this in Hyde Park.

It may be selfishness on the part of the President to want it in Hyde Park, but if he does, then he should erect a building of his own there and put his papers in it, let people pay for the privilege of getting in and seeing them and



reading them. If, however, we are going to expend the money of the United States Government for the erection of this building and its maintenance, the place for that building is here in Washington where it will do the people of the country some good. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin yields back 1 minute.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct my remarks to the language on the bottom of page 7 of the bill, which reads:

*Provided, That the Archivist is authorized to charge and collect, under regulations prescribed by him, a fee not in excess of 25 cents per person for the privilege of visiting and viewing the exhibit rooms or museum portion of the said library.*

Mr. Chairman, some few days ago I introduced in the House a resolution calling for the investigation of a new program which has been instituted by the Secretary of the Interior under which they are now beginning to charge entrance fees to public buildings and exhibits which have heretofore been open to the public without charge, and been visited by tens of thousands of people. It seems to me it approaches the stage of disgrace for us in this day and age to extract from high school boys and girls who come to Washington from our various school districts, dimes, and quarters, and 50-cent pieces in order to see these great national shrines. I can hardly comprehend that in this day and age when we vote money so recklessly we would permit the imposition on the traveling public of such charges in this manner and as set forth in this bill. I hope before the bill is voted upon that the 25-cent charge provided for in the language I have quoted will be stricken out; and that when we read the bill under the 5-minute rule the Committee will also eliminate all of section 303, which provides for an additional 25 cents per person for the privilege of visiting and viewing the property. This 50-cent charge is unreasonable and should never be imposed upon our visiting and traveling public.

I also trust that in the days to come we can prevail upon the Secretary of the Interior to remove the 10- and 25-cent charge which I understand has been imposed as an entrance fee to some of the shrines in Washington. The American public is a traveling public; and when a father and mother scrape enough funds together to bring their family 500 or more miles to see these things, they dislike to be informed upon their arrival that the family cannot see them without having to pay \$1.50, or \$2 for the crowd.

I shall not support the pending bill for numerous reasons unnecessary for me to state at this time. The place for the library is here in Washington where the earnest students of our country come for the purpose of consulting State records. I have not heard of hotel facilities or medium-priced eating places or living facilities near the Hyde Park home and project so that a student could go and remain there for research. Even though the student did go there he would not have available to him all the collateral records and documents he would find in Washington. So, from the purely economic standpoint I would not support this bill or a similar bill for any President, be he Republican, Democrat, or of some other political complexion. The place for these records is here in Washington. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the former distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Library, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE].

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, in the course of my service here I cannot recall an address meant to accomplish an end that was so adequate, thorough, and complete in presenting the reasons why that end should not be accomplished as the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], a man whom we greatly esteem and admire. This time, however, he laid before the Committee the overpowering reason why this bill should not pass. This reason is to be found in his

address from first to last. His argument was one of personality.

Personality is exactly the reason, and the overpowering reason for the precedent and the practice of society in not commemorating a man while he is living. The gentleman from Texas laid before the House a list of the Presidents and extolled all of them. I will join with him in his praise of the Presidents; but he neglected to tell the House that of the 30 Presidents we have had, not one of them, so far as I know, ever hinted any wish for commemoration while he was alive. Thirty Presidents, with the same pride in their work, the same satisfaction in their achievements, the same belief that they were useful to their fellow men, have not sought to be commemorated while they were alive. These Presidents, one after the other, have left records of service and achievement which of themselves warrant their praise. These Presidents have had enemies, as any President would have. These Presidents have adhered to ideals that have aroused wide controversy, yet none of them have sought to inject that controversy into a question of commemoration while living.

We do not know what the future may say about our great men until years have passed, until we get a perspective, until we can make comparisons; so very wisely men from time immemorial have refrained from this practice of commemoration during life. I venture to say that no man in this Chamber, either on the Democratic side or on the Republican side, will begrudge due honor to the present President of the United States after he has finished his term on this globe. It is not impossible and it is to be hoped that no Republican here approaches the question with any intent of aspersion on the President now. I do say that the paramount question is, Should there be commemoration during life?

There are other questions. There is the fact that this program contemplates the least use of the papers. It is made difficult and costly to have access to them and it deviates from what is the desire of the Congress that all the records of all our Presidents shall be easily accessible to students.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. In what year did Washington die, does the gentleman remember?

Mr. LUCE. In 1799, I think.

Mr. KELLER. When did the Commonwealth of Virginia erect the Washington statue in Virginia?

Mr. LUCE. I was not present on that occasion.

Mr. KELLER. It does a terrible thing to the gentleman's comment, because that was done in 1784. Many other monuments were built to Washington while he was still alive.

Mr. LUCE. Was any monument to him erected by appropriation or legislation by the Congress while he was alive?

Mr. KELLER. The question involved in the gentleman's argument, and in the argument of several other gentlemen, is that no monuments have ever been built by acts of Congress to men while they were living. I have called his attention to the fact that the State of Virginia erected a memorial to George Washington in 1784, 15 years before Washington's death. The answer to the contention concerning acts of Congress is contained in the erection of the bust of Theodore Roosevelt by legislative act. In 1886 a resolution passed the Senate providing for the placing of busts of the Vice Presidents in the vacant niches of the Senate Chamber from time to time. Most of those busts were placed while the Vice Presidents were still living. Incidentally, may I say we ought to have learned enough by now to paint the portraits of our Speakers while in office, which we have not done until recently.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Did Washington ask the Congress of the United States that his statue be erected in Virginia?

Mr. LUCE. The gentleman from Illinois can answer that question.

Mr. KELLER. I did not hear it.

Mr. DONDERO. Did Washington or any other President ever ask the Congress to appropriate money to erect a statue?

Mr. KELLER. This is not a monument in that sense. The gentleman from Massachusetts, as well informed as he is, did not know that Washington had a number of monuments built to him while he was still living. These gentlemen are falling under the illusion, very widely spread in this country, that monuments and memorials are erected only to men after they are dead. There are so many exceptions to this idea that it is no longer accepted as the rule.

But the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library is not a memorial to Mr. Roosevelt. It is a depository for the great gift that he is making to the American people, just as the fine gallery of art is not a memorial to Mr. Mellon, but a depository to his great gift to the American people. One is giving of the wealth of his intense public life, and the other of his great wealth. The whole question seems to be a criticism of recognizing a man until he is dead and gone.

Mr. DONDERO. Were any monuments built at the request of the Presidents themselves?

Mr. KELLER. I do not know that Washington asked the Congress to "Please erect a monument." But Washington did sit, over a long period of time for the great sculptor, Houdon, and did entertain him at Mount Vernon while the mask was being modeled. Washington was certainly a willing partner to the making of that statute, and rightly so.

Mr. DONDERO. Did any President request a monument to be erected on his private estate?

Mr. KELLER. They did erect this Houdon statue down in Richmond.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman from Illinois has mentioned the fact that busts have been made of the Vice Presidents. I am quite sure the gentleman from Illinois will not make the statement that the Senate took the action necessary to bring about the making of those busts at the express desire or wish of the Vice President himself.

Mr. KELLER. Maybe not; but in 1886 there was a resolution passed by the Senate for that purpose.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. While the gentleman is on that question, may I suggest to him that he show the House or the committee just where and when the Vice President involved requested that action?

Mr. KELLER. The Senate of the United States did it.

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Would the gentleman be willing to vote for a bill that would create a bust of the President and put it up here?

Mr. LUCE. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to answer the question?

Mr. KELLER. I would like to have the question again.

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. I inquired of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts whether he would be willing to now vote for an appropriation to provide a bust of the President and put it up here in the Capitol.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion we are giving consideration this afternoon to a proposition that is unprecedented and at this time unnecessary. It is the first time in the history of this country that a President, while living and holding office, has requested the Congress of the United States to appropriate money from the Treasury to provide, as I see it, a memorial on his behalf.

I appreciate what the majority floor leader had to say on behalf of our President, and am not here to take issue with the distinguished gentleman. I regret that the floor leader of the House has seen fit to decide for us how this measure is going to be passed and that it will be agreed to along party lines. I am interested, however, in the attention which is being paid to this measure. To the left of me I think there are probably more than half of the Republican Members

on the floor, and to the right I think I can count about 20 or 22 Members; yet when the roll is called in an hour from now the Democratic Members to my right will file down and cast their votes in favor of this measure.

It just seems to me that in all fairness, if the distinguished President of the United States who is now in office—and according to reports we have, he does not expect to retire for some time—wants to make sure that Congress will provide a memorial to him—someone has said it was not a memorial, but that is what it is—to be located in the State of New York, if he really wants to be magnanimous in a matter of this kind, he should be glad to turn over whatever there may be among his papers that are of importance to this Government of ours and let them be placed in the Library of Congress or The Archives Building, so recently completed at a cost of millions of dollars.

Strange as it may seem, the bill provides that the man in charge of the archives is the one who is to look after this collection of correspondence away over here in the State of New York. This is a precedent, of course, but we have had a good many precedents during this administration. This is an additional one—and that may not be so important. But it just seems to me that it is a pretty poor time to ask this Congress to agree to underwrite, if you please, a statement that it will provide whatever funds may be required to establish this great memorial and then keep it going from now to time immemorial. We have not been given any estimate as to the expense of it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Perhaps the Congressional Library wants only public papers. Perhaps they would not want to house his models and his paper dolls.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I assume those in charge of the Library could certainly agree with those in charge of The Archives as to what papers would really be of interest to the people of the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do appreciate the fine speeches which have been made on behalf of this legislation in the name of loyalty to a great man. But let us get down to some of the facts in the case. This is the first time, so far as I can find out, that Congress has ever been asked to appropriate money to provide a shrine or memorial in the name of a President—to be established outside the city of Washington. If these papers and documents that have been described are valuable—and I will concede that many of them are valuable—then why not house them, at very little additional expense to the Government, in the buildings here in Washington? In the Library of Congress, if you please, where documents of other Presidents are housed and where the great Constitution and the Declaration of Independence are preserved and displayed. At the expense of millions of dollars, our Government has provided these buildings right here in the Capital City for the purpose, among other things, of housing documents of this nature. Here they are accessible to students and others who care to examine them.

Under this bill it is proposed that the President shall give 12 acres of ground in an inaccessible place in the State of New York, where the Government or somebody is to provide a building and guarantee the maintenance of such building until time immemorial. Except, and provided, however, that a fee of 25 cents is to be charged those who may want to go down to Hyde Park, N. Y., to examine these papers.

And so this afternoon it seems to me unreasonable and inconsistent that this Congress—even before the present term of the President has expired—should agree to take on an obligation of hundreds of thousands of dollars to establish a memorial in the name of our President. I have called attention to the fact that there is no limitation in this bill as to what it will cost or how much will be required to maintain it. An amendment will be offered to limit the maintenance expense to \$12,000 per year. That is \$1,000 per month. I predict



that this House will vote that amendment down by a big majority.

Members of Congress, this is a critical time in our economic history. The taxpayers of our country are being plunged deeper and deeper into debt. Thousands and millions of our people do not have even the necessities of life. We are not justified in underwriting an obligation that will cost these taxpayers some hundreds of thousands of dollars when, in my judgment, it is absolutely uncalled for and unnecessary.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Was it not Cato who said, "I would rather have coming generations ask, 'Why is there not a monument to Cato?' than 'Why is there one?'"

Mr. REES of Kansas. Something has been said about being loyal to the President of the United States. We all want to be loyal to the President, but I do not believe this is a question of loyalty at all. It is a question of whether or not the United States Government is going to start out here, while the President is in office, and agree to spend some hundreds of thousands of dollars in the State of New York to perpetuate the name of the President and establish a memorial for him in place of putting it in the Capital City, where folks can view it if they really care anything about it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman believe there is any danger of anyone's ever forgetting Roosevelt?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman can answer his own question. I am saying that this is a pretty poor time to ask the taxpayers of this country to provide funds for a memorial of this kind. If the President really wants this library, if he is so generous in this matter, why does he not go ahead and establish his shrine himself, and establish it right here in the city of Washington, where we can all have a chance to get the benefit of this great collection?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Why can we not establish it where a self-respecting Republican can go?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am very much interested in the gentleman's description of having a lot of men hired to look over these papers and keep them intact in years to come. I wonder if anybody has taken the precaution to have somebody look over the papers and see if they can find any of real worth there?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would not care to answer that question. Let me say again, let these papers be housed in Government buildings in this great Capital City of Washington, so they may be easily accessible to the public, free of charge. If the President is anxious that the documents be preserved for the benefit of those who are to come after him, then let them be placed in the repositories that have already been established for that purpose.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, it is a rather unpleasant task any Republican has to perform here today in opposing this proposition, because we realize in advance that we will be charged with playing petty politics. For inexplicable reasons certain newspapers will heap opprobrium upon our heads. Because of our traditional and our inherent or innate respect for the Presidency of the United States, any American citizen is loath or reluctant to criticize any occupant of the White House, whoever he may happen to be. This particular measure, however, is a most unusual and extraordinary one, violating all customs, traditions, and precedents of days gone by. That is, perhaps, because the present occupant of the White House will go down in history if for nothing else as the great precedent-breaker. That is

the reason he has been campaigning for a third term ever since his inauguration for a first term.

Now we find an occupant of the White House not only in his lifetime but even before he has finished his term of office sanctioning if not asking the Congress of the United States to build a memorial to his memory. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe in building memorials to live men, neither does any other Member of this body honestly believe in it. The only argument that has been advanced here today for the passage of this measure has been an appeal to partisan prejudice. Why the President is eager to build a memorial to himself before he goes out of office I cannot understand, unless he has been suddenly seized with an inner conviction or his intuition tells him that he is soon to experience a political demise.

I am sure that the great men of the past—even Homer through Aristides and Aeschylus and others of the ancient Greeks—were never concerned as to whether or not their writings would be saved for posterity. I am sure that Horace and Ovid and Cicero were never anxious to have a memorial erected to house their writings before they died. I cannot believe that Dante and Rousseau and Voltaire were greatly worried as to what the future might brand them. Not even immortal Shakespeare or Milton or Wordsworth would have the unmitigated gall and brazen effrontery to ask that a monument be erected to them to house their precious pearls of wisdom before their death.

I remember that the greatest teacher of all time, a lowly carpenter from Nazareth, never left any libraries. He never wrote but once, with his finger in the sand, but His philosophy has not been lost and His teachings have not been forgotten. Mr. Chairman, that which is worth remembering never dies. But, of course, the Great Teacher possessed the mark of all true greatness—namely, humility and modesty. Mr. Roosevelt might be charged with many high crimes and misdemeanors, but there is certainly one charge that neither friend nor foe can ever launch against him, and that is that he possesses either modesty or humility.

Why the President of the United States insists on having his voluminous writings housed at his country estate in Hyde Park, far removed from the National Capital, will baffle the imagination of any fair-minded and honest man. Is he afraid to have his precious, immortal documents housed in the Library of Congress, where the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence are framed and enshrined? Is he fearful that by placing his writings in either the Congressional Library or The Archives Building down on Constitution Avenue that they might be polluted or contaminated by the Farewell Address of the Father of our Country, by the Gettysburg Address of Abraham Lincoln, and by the immortal writings of Thomas Jefferson, or are these writings of the President which he sold a year and a half ago for huge sums, reputedly receiving \$100,000 or \$150,000—and remember they were press conferences as well as addresses, which he had forbidden newspapermen to report, yet he sold not only his own property, but their property, their questions as well as his answers for a colossal, stupendous sum which his secretary, Stephen Early, said would some day be handed over to a great public cause, but there is not one line or one word in this joint resolution turning over any of the money received by Mr. Roosevelt for the five large volumes that were published and on which he received enormous royalties—are these writings of Mr. Roosevelt so far superior to all others that they deserve a place all their own? This library he insists be erected on his own home estate, and any improvement to that estate or increase in value to it caused by the construction of a building or buildings on 12 acres, more or less—that is how definite and certain and clear it is—erected by the public's money and maintained and kept by the taxpayers' funds out of the United States Treasury, shall not be subject to taxation during the existence of any life estate reserved in the property. The President, after insisting that the library be on his own estate, erected by public funds, maintained out of the Federal Treasury, is going to charge the poor, forgotten man in this country "two bits" to enter

the grounds and then "two bits" more to get into the museum where the library is housed. [Laughter.]

Oh, this friend of the "forgotten man"! You know, this Roosevelt family is a most unusual family. They are lovers of the downtrodden and the underprivileged, but they are always sure that none of the kids marry any of that kind. [Laughter.]

I submit, in all fairness, that there has never been such a public display of colossal conceit or such an unblushing parade of swashbuckling egotism as is contained in this measure. Only an egocentric megalomaniac would have the nerve to ask for such a measure, and yet it is going to be crammed down our throats this afternoon by an appeal to blind partisan prejudice. Only posterity and only time can properly evaluate the greatness of any man. I have no objection whatever to Mr. Roosevelt's papers being conserved. Certainly I do not want his campaign speeches of 1932 destroyed. They are his best utterances. I do not know who wrote them.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] says, "Well, the United States Government is going to vote funds to keep up the new National Gallery of Art." I want to say there is no analogy or parallel whatever between the National Gallery of Art and this proposed public library to be established at Hyde Park. Why? Because the National Gallery was given outright by a former Secretary of the Treasury who was so modest that he did not want it even named after him. It is not the Mellon Gallery of Art; it is the National Gallery of Art; and he donated an art collection worth anywhere from \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000, and he left \$10,000,000 more to erect the building, and, I understand, a certain sum to be used as an endowment for future acquisitions, and it is being built after he is dead and gone.

Mr. Roosevelt will not have to worry about having a monument erected to his memory. The monumental public debt that is heaped upon the backs of the American taxpayers, through this orgy of New Deal spending, will painfully remind generations to come of Franklin I, and, God let us hope, the last. [Laughter.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SHORT. In all seriousness, even if you favor the construction of this public library at Hyde Park, instead of placing Mr. Roosevelt's writings along with our other great statesmen—and you see I am generous enough to include him with them—in the Library of Congress and The Archives Building, I believe that no man here today will insist that this is a vitally urgent and necessary thing at this particular moment.

However desirable the proposition may be, it is not indispensable at this critical period in our history, when the American taxpayers are staggering under an unbearable burden of public debt. I pause to remind you gentlemen that in the past 6 years under the unprecedented New Deal spending, our public debt has been doubled. It is \$45,000,000,000 today, and the interest on that debt is over a billion dollars a year—17 cents out of every Federal tax dollar going to pay the interest on the public debt. Forty-five billion dollars is a sum that is incomprehensible and it staggers the imagination. If we started paying \$500,000,000 a year on our national debt, it would take 5 generations, or 90 years, to pay off that debt. If we started paying off \$500,000,000 of our national debt every year, it would take 3 generations, or 60 years, to reduce the debt to the point where it was when Mr. Roosevelt took over the reins of Government. With this crushing debt to carry, with 12,000,000 men out of work, with labor strife everywhere, we have wasted a whole day debating the proposal to erect a shrine to the man who is responsible for these deplorable conditions. And how in the name of God, Representatives of the American people, Democrats and Republicans alike, can give their stamp of approval to such an unprecedented and unnecessary proposal as this, which violates all tradition and history, to satisfy the inordinate vanity of one individual, I leave for future generations to determine. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, we all like the able, distinguished, and very eloquent gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. The gentleman from Missouri is humorous. Sometimes he tells stories designed to be witty and if we cannot laugh at the joke of the age, we can often laugh at the age of the joke. The type of story in which the gentleman usually indulges is calculated to arouse all of us to laughter and appeal to our risibilities, but the eloquence to which he has given expression this afternoon is a disgrace to the House of Representatives. His attack upon one of the great men that American history has produced is decidedly disgraceful and out of place. It comes with poor taste from the gentleman of Missouri. Whatever faults may be charged to the President of the United States, no one can properly attribute to him the foibles and peccadilloes of his own children, if there be such. The charge that the children of the President have married into the families of the wealthy and not into the families of the common people of the United States, whether true or false, and certainly the blame, if there be any blame, should not be laid at the feet of the President of the United States.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me right there?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SIROVICH. I call the attention of the gentleman to one irresponsible statement made by the previous speaker to this effect: A month ago while I was sick I was visited by Elliott Roosevelt, one of the sons of the President. He told me that when the President was elected he, Elliott, had no position. The President refused to allow him to use his name even to secure a position. Elliott then, with only \$40 or \$50 in his possession, rode with his wife in an automobile to Los Angeles and there secured a position with Mr. William Randolph Hearst. He did that through his own indefatigable ability. He was to write in the Hearst newspapers on the subject of aviation. Although the son of the President of the United States, he relied upon his own individual efforts to secure work, which would give him an opportunity to rise on the ladder of fame and fortune. He did not marry a great heiress, as the previous speaker intimated. It is a great regret to me, Mr. Chairman, that gentlemen in discussing the advisability of taking over the President's papers and bequeathing them to posterity, should attack the children of the President of the United States.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I re-echo the able statements made by the majority leader of the House of Representatives. When this House stoops to the disgraceful level of resorting to personalities and abuse of the President of the United States as the basis for an argument justifying their vote against a bill which 90 percent of all the Republican newspapers in the United States have endorsed, it seems to me they have reached the extreme nadir of partisanship in the Congress of the United States. Whatever faults may be attributed to Mr. Roosevelt, history will regard him as one of the great humanitarian Presidents of this generation. I think of Roosevelt as a man who may be likened unto Abraham Lincoln who said:

Die when I may—I want it said of me by those who knew me best that I always plucked a thistle and planted a flower, where I thought a flower would grow.

Edward Markham spoke in poetry of Abraham Lincoln, and he said of him that he was a man "who matched the mountains and compelled the stars to turn aside to conquer him." All of the diabolical, vindictive jeremiads in which the Republicans have indulged during this debate will rise to haunt the President's next adversary in the campaign of 1940. All the vindictive attacks made upon the President of the United States will not justify one single modicum or one iota of the attack made on this bill.

This is an opportunity for the Congress of the United States to acquire the writings of a great President, a President whom



history will record as one of the four outstanding Presidents of the United States. Yes, we can indulge in our would-be humorous, feebly witty attacks upon a man whose shoes, in some cases, we are not even fit to shine. It seems to me that this performance today is something that ought to make the common people of America rise up and denounce in their wrath the kind of attacks that are being made upon the Presidents of the United States. Let us rise above personalities in this critical period of American history. Let us pass the bill and go on to other things. Let us do something for the plain people of America whose sufferings are crying out in their righteousness in every part of the land. Let us rise above the level of the low degrees to which this Congress has descended. I am ashamed of my colleagues. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I think the answer to many of the arguments—I say “arguments”—against this bill is completely summarized in an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of June 7, 1939, and with your indulgence I shall read from it. The editorial is entitled “Frisivolous Objections.” It reads as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 7, 1939]

#### FRIVOLOUS OBJECTIONS

Last December, Mr. Roosevelt announced his intention of setting up at Hyde Park, “for the first time in this country, what might be called a source-material collection relating to a specific period in our history.” It would include all his papers and correspondence from 1910, besides books, paintings, portraits. The collection was to be housed in a building built by private subscription. The property was to go ultimately to the Federal Government. Mr. Roosevelt also wished that the family house at Hyde Park and the greater part of his estate there should be taken over by Congress after his death. It is hard to see any high motive in the almost unanimous opposition of the House Republicans to the bill to carry out the President's purposes.

Some grounds of objection were patently frivolous. Why not stow the collections in The Archives Building? It is true that Mr. Roosevelt wanted the primary responsibility for the care of his material to rest in the Archivist of the United States; but The National Archives of the United States collects only records from Government agencies. With historical manuscripts of other kinds it has nothing to do. Representative FISH said that the measure would be a precedent, so that papers of future Presidents “would be scattered all around the country.” Well, the papers of past Presidents are scattered all around the country. Those of Jefferson are divided among the Library of Congress, the Massachusetts Historical Society, the Missouri Historical Society, the University of Virginia, and many other places, as well as among private persons.

The papers of the two Adamases are in Quincy. Buchanan's and Pierce's are scattered. Upon the advice of distinguished historians, Mr. Roosevelt decided to keep his collection in one place. The judgment of the historians is sufficient authority. It is hard to understand why most of the Republicans in the House opposed a bill so evidently meritorious; and the wisdom of the Democratic leaders in suspending the rules and so requiring a two-thirds vote remains mysterious. Doubtless the bill will yet be passed in the ordinary manner. Aside from partisanship, the only intelligible reason for objection is the notion that everything should be piled up in Washington. That is a queer notion for Republicans to hold now.

[Applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that I am getting to be an egocentric megalomaniac, because I really had a sincere desire a while ago to be able to follow on the floor that modest, shy, retiring flower of the Ozarks and to come immediately after his speech. You will all readily recognize that a man has to be a little bit conceited to think that he can do that effectively. It happens I did not have that opportunity.

I do not think this is a matter that should be charged with partisanship. For my part I am not going to raise that issue and I trust nobody else will, but I do think a couple of statements recently made ought to be corrected.

In the first place, it has been said that this is supposed to be a “monument” to President Roosevelt or a memorial to President Roosevelt for his own writings. Now that

simply is not the case. What this proposal is, is that a gift be given by Franklin D. Roosevelt to the United States of America if Congress chooses to accept it, and that that gift consist of a collection made at the expense of the President himself and not in the nature of a memorial or monument or collection of his personal writings at all. Everybody who has taken the trouble to look into the matter knows that this is a very valuable collection of material, entirely aside of anything that may have come from the pen of the President.

In addition to that it happens to occur to me that when a proposal is made by somebody in the nature of a gift like this, it is up to the recipient to consider the matter from that standpoint. I do not see why the man who offers to make a gift of this kind does not have the right to make suggestions as to how the thing shall be handled, where it shall be placed, and under what circumstances it shall be taken care of. One gentleman who was opposing the measure made a speech here this afternoon and suggested that the President himself should have put up the money to build a building in Washington in which to house this material. I am as convinced as that I am standing here that had that been done the gentleman on that side of the House would have yelled twice as loud about egocentric megalomaniacs and other choice bits like that, because they would have said, “Here is a man who does not think that Congress would accept this and so he is going out here and do it himself to make sure that these things are preserved.”

I think it has been done with very good taste. I think a proposal has been made which, as is evident on the floor of the House, can be criticized and discussed in the House and we can decide whether we want to accept this or not. I believe that it smacks not at all of the charges that have been made. Another thing I resented was when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] made the remark that “the President proposed to charge the people of America two bits to get into this building.” I hope the gentleman did not intend to leave the impression that the President was personally going to collect the money, but I think if he had meant to do that he did a pretty good job of it. I think if he thought it over he would not want to leave that false impression.

There is one respect in which I agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. He said he did not think this was a matter that was particularly vital at this time; he thought other things were more important. So do I. I wish we might be considering this afternoon, in a more deliberate mood than we were able to do before, just what is going to happen on the 1st of September this year in accordance with the so-called relief bill that was recently passed. I am glad to say I did all I could to change that bill, for according to its terms it will be required that 700,000 people who have been compelled to depend upon the W. P. A. for a living for the last year and a half must be summarily dismissed on September 1. What are they to do? It is time that was considered here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman. I wish we could be considering that, but I think the gentlemen who are opposing this measure would not give us much help toward getting a chance to consider a thing of that sort. The Republican Members voted solidly, with, maybe, three or four exceptions, for these enforced dismissals, and so I think they would be very much opposed to our reopening a question of that kind, though it is likely to be very serious. I am not one who likes to see protests against Government action take place in the country, but I am one who believes that the Congress should consider the measures it takes in order that they may be just and fair, and I am one who believes that we should look forward to things that may take place in the future. I am also one who believes that we have no responsibility that weighs upon us quite so heavily as the responsibility of seeing to it that the budgets of the modest

citizens of this country are balanced at the level of a decent subsistence. Evidently there is not time to go into a discussion of that, but I would remark to you that I made a speech in the House day before yesterday, which consumed 20 precious minutes, in which I discussed the matter of the national debt and what seemed to me necessary to be done in connection with it. I need only say this: It is my thought that the national debt was contracted very largely by the selling of Government bonds to private banks for deposits of bank credit that had been created particularly for that purpose, and I cannot see why the credit of this Nation is not equally good to redeem that debt. I feel we would have no difficulty in doing so; but I must get back to the subject at hand today.

I believe this is a matter properly put forward, that important records of this most stirring time in the history of this country, collected by a man who happened to be President in one of the critical periods in our history, should become national property, housed in a proper place, and available to future generations. I believe that it is a proposition that the Congress with dignity should accept. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all of the Republican Members of the House do not oppose this resolution. I am also sure that a number of Republicans have not distinguished between the personal papers of the President and the contents of this library which Franklin D. Roosevelt is willing to turn over to the Government. In this library are some 15,000 volumes of some of the rarest books and historical documents to be found anywhere in the United States. There is nothing in these documents and historical books that has anything whatever to do with any activity on the part of Mr. Roosevelt. It is a collection of great value to the people of the United States. So far as his own writings are concerned, it is too early to form any estimate of what the American people will think of them. It is not too early, however, to accept from the hand of the President one of the greatest private libraries in the United States. I do not understand why there should be any opposition to this.

I for one feel that 50 years from now the place that Franklin D. Roosevelt will occupy in United States history will be quite different from today's sentiment upon my side of the House. I as one Republican am willing to confess openly that, considering the condition of affairs when President Roosevelt came into power in this country, he, more than any other man in the United States, is responsible for our having a representative form of government. [Applause.] If he has made any mistakes since, and he has, and I do not always vote with him—if he has made mistakes history will take care of that, but history cannot take away from him the position he occupies in being the source of inspiration for the American people to continue this form of government. I am for this Government. I want to make this Government better. If there is a weak place in it I want to weed it out. For this very reason some people call me an enemy of this Government, but I am a friend of this Government, and I think Franklin D. Roosevelt is; and when history is written 50 years from now I think it will contain nothing of which even the Republicans need be ashamed. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to see this debate this afternoon based on partisan grounds. It reminds me of the occasion a few years ago when a somewhat similar bill was before the House for consideration in connection with the National Gallery of Art and the acceptance of a gift from Mr. Mellon. I did not see partisanship brought into that debate. I believe the gentlemen on this side of the aisle—Democratic—went along and helped to carry out the plan for that great monument to one who was quite a contrast to the present Chief Executive, one who had

through his monopolies collected millions and millions from the poor people of the country. I think nothing much was said about that nor about the great tax fraud scandals that came along; yet Members on my side of the aisle overlooked those things, the suits were dismissed, the matter was forgotten, and we let his memory go on for the good things he did. After all, there are more good things in the life of a person than there are bad. I prefer to remember the good things and good works of a man, rather than the bad.

Never in the history of our country have we had a man who has done so much for the American people, the needy, the rank and file, the oppressed, the underprivileged, the meek, and the weak as the man who is now trying to do a little something more for the American people by leaving to them at least the soil which would perpetuate a portion of the memory of his great deeds for the American people. Mr. Chairman, it is most appropriate that this Congress should participate in a plan of this kind for one who has been instrumental, and the leader, in redeeming economic conditions and the economic life of the American people. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN. This man came into office at a time when 15,000 banks were closed, when wheat brought 18 cents, corn 10 cents, and when the annual income of the American people had dropped to about \$38,000,000,000.

My colleagues will recall that during the dark days of the Hoover administration just preceding the Roosevelt administration the economic condition of our country was probably the most chaotic it has been since its creation during and after the Revolutionary War. Industries had almost ceased to produce, millions of workers were idle, thousands of these unemployed were walking the highways and actually begging for food. Soup and bread lines had been established in the larger populated centers. These soup and bread lines were rapidly exhausting the ability of the local communities and cities to pay for the food for the needy. It was almost impossible to obtain employment of any kind. There was practically no market for labor. Able-bodied men were forced to work for from 50 cents a day upward, or to beg for existence. Millions of them could not even obtain employment at 50 cents a day. About half of the farmers in the country were under mortgage and foreclosure of these mortgages was going on to an alarming degree. Millions of homes other than farms were under mortgage and the debtors had no hope of ever paying off these mortgages.

So hungry were the people, many of them, and so destitute and desperate, until in some communities they were in groups forcing their way into grocery stores and other business establishments and helping themselves to the necessities of life and carrying adequate food out to feed their families. These men were not stealing and could not be classed as criminals. They were hungry American citizens, starving in a land of plenty. This, my friends, was under Republican administration, and little if anything was being done by the Federal Government to even recognize it, to say nothing of trying to relieve it.

There was practically no market for raw materials, particularly farm materials; neither was there purchasing power in the hands of the farmers or in the hands of the former wage earners of factories. Credit hardly existed because the banks had closed on the savings of the American people, and those who had remaining funds were afraid to make loans. There were, of course, many other deplorable conditions in our country, but time will not permit, nor is this the opportunity, to enumerate them in further detail.

Probably the most tragic and threatening of all conditions at that time was the doubt existing in the minds of millions of our true and patriotic American citizens. They were beginning to doubt whether or not they could even govern themselves and whether or not the country could endure for many more months without actual revolution, bloodshed, and forceful appropriation of property for the relief of want and



necessity. My friends, under these conditions we found the American people in 1932.

Now, what is the contrast today? I believe each of you will joyously appreciate the vast difference in the economic life of America today and during that trying period. I doubt that there ever was a period in the history of our country when conditions have changed as favorably in the same length of time. After the American people asserted themselves for redemption of their Government in 1932, they worked rapidly toward this achievement. Practically no banks have closed their doors since the Democrats took over the administration; millions have obtained gainful employment, and I am speaking of those who were unemployed in 1932; the prices of farm commodities have at all times, I believe, during the past 6½ years been higher than they were in 1932; and the general average of farm prices during this 6½-year period is probably twice as high as during 1932; factory outputs have increased from 100 percent to 1,000 percent since 1932; purchasing power has been placed in the hands of the rank and file of our people to such an extent that the total income of our people has almost doubled since 1932.

Some of my alarmist friends speak about the huge Federal funds expended and I grant you that funds have been expended, but the American people have the goods to show for practically every dollar of that which has been expended. School buildings, highways, hospitals, river and harbor improvements, flood control, navigation and power dams, Federal buildings of all kinds, streets, sidewalks, city halls, county court houses, and countless other public improvements stand out as lasting monuments to the wisdom of these Federal expenditures. If you would take stock today of the value of these Federal improvements, you will find that only a small amount of money has been lost through these expenditures. In addition to these physical properties, the human element has largely entered in. The American people have been fed. You do not see them now walking the highways and humbly begging for something to eat. This is a very rare occasion now. Practically all of them are gainfully employed and I do not believe that many people are actually hungry, and none should be. It is the duty of the American civilization and the Government to provide the necessities of life and to make possible the comforts of life for every individual under the American flag.

Vast improvement has occurred during these 6½ years. Credit is now obtainable. Farm produce is salable. Factory outputs are in fairly good demand, and beyond and above and more important than all of this is the fact that the American people are more contented and are happier. Children are now attending school and having warm food given to them during the noon hour—children who previously stayed at home, hungry and without garments to wear to school. Millions of young boys and girls through the C. C. C. camps and N. Y. A. are developing into proud and respected American citizens. Now, some of my colleagues would severely criticize and low-rate these marvelous achievements and culminate their criticisms and objections here today against the founding of an appropriate establishment for the spearhead of these betterments.

This library undertaking, proposed today, is not one to cause a big Federal expenditure and in this connection, I call your attention to the following statement from the committee's report:

Before finally arriving at his decision to offer these collections to the Government, Mr. Roosevelt sought the advice of a representative group of distinguished American scholars and publicists and, with their advice and approval, worked out the plan proposed. There was organized also, under the chairmanship of Hon. Frank C. Walker, a group of businessmen and other public-spirited citizens to help in raising funds for the construction of the library building at private rather than public expense.

Now, you will see from this that all of the extraneous statements brought out here today are far afield from the purpose of this bill. This is one of the small things in which we can help our great Chief Executive to render a service to the future generations of America. It is most appropriate that this be done and done now. It will, in a way, be a small token of

service and I predict now that no library in the world will draw the attention, respect, and appreciation of future generations as will this one. The documents therein will be read and appreciated more and more as the years pass on. People for ages have erected monuments and tokens to those whom the world calls great; savage tribes and primitive Americans had their own way of commemorating deeds and achievements. Likewise, civilized man has done it in other ways. The pyramids, cones, towers, and edifices were long ago erected in the valley of the Nile. They stand there today in token of the achievements of man and of generations.

Throughout the ages achievements have been commemorated. Monuments have been erected to emperors whose scepters have been symbols of universal power; to soldiers who have won their way to fame beneath the flashes of the sword; to statesmen whom the world has called great; to poets whose songs have been the mirrors of the passions and the hopes and glories of the age; to philosophers who have sought to penetrate the secrets of the stars; to religious teachers whose flocks follow without question. But to all whose memory should be carried on none stand out greater than he who successfully strives to liberate economic bondage of the weak, the meek, and the underprivileged. In this role I doubt that service and accomplishments have ever exceeded that of Franklin D. Roosevelt. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I have heard statements made by the last two or three gentlemen who spoke regarding an appeal to partisanship. I am sure most of you were here when the chairman of the Rules Committee made his statement in reference to the rule, and I must say that I never heard a more flagrant appeal to partisanship in this House. I refer to the statement that the gentleman made about the minority leader on the floor of the House. The gentleman from Illinois used the expression that the whip was used. I deeply resented the statement of the gentleman from Illinois that the minority leader of this House had used a whip on the Members on the Republican side. Frankly, may I say that we have attended three or four conferences on this side of the House and there never has been an occasion when the minority leader has used the whip or steam rolled any Member to go along with any legislation that he was espousing. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] did not impress me in quite the same way as they did the gentleman from Ohio; but I was interested in the kind advice he was endeavoring to give the Republican side of the House. He said that we ought to be nonpartisan. Really, why should that not apply much more directly at this particular time to his own side of the House rather than involving the Republican side?

Mr. Chairman, we have not brought partisanship into this debate. That has been brought in entirely by the other side of the House. I want in my humble way to make reference also to the remarks of the majority leader. The majority leader indulged in pure surmise when he said that there never would have been any fault found on the Democratic side if a Republican President had asked that a memorial be erected to himself. Mr. Chairman, I came here, I am happy to say, at the same time the majority leader did. I have admired his career. It has been a privilege and an honor to serve with him. But I cannot conceive of any one of the Republican Presidents, and he named them, wanting to express any such intention of erecting a memorial to himself, which the present occupant of the White House is doing by forcing the pending bill through the Congress at the present time.

Mr. FISH. During their lifetime.

Mr. TREADWAY. That goes without saying. The present occupant of the White House, of course, is alive.

He also cast reflection upon our good colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish] in that he said that Mr. Fish disliked the present occupant of the White House personally. I do not know as to that fact myself, but I wish to say to my friend from Texas that I am a great personal admirer of the present occupant of the White House. I know of no more genial, friendly, and kindly disposed person in a personal way than Franklin D. Roosevelt. I like him. [Applause.] He is a neighbor of mine, across the Hudson River. I remember at one time calling on him, and he addressed me as "the hillbilly from the Berkshires," saying that he could see my district from his back steps. All that is a pleasantry between men and I admire him for that type of character. However, I cannot agree with any part of his policies nor do I agree with what is before us today, which has to do with aggrandizing the present occupant of the White House while, as the gentleman from New York says, he is still alive.

There is very little that I know to add in the way of argument to what has been said during this debate. I wish, however, to call attention particularly to the fact that the gentleman from Illinois, my distinguished chairman, read in very great detail from the supposed report of the committee. I maintain, Mr. Chairman, in this debate, and I maintained in the debate when this question was up for consideration before, that this is a phony report. I am a member of the Library Committee, and have tried to be fairly active in attendance upon that committee, but to the best of my knowledge and belief no hearing was ever held on the bill before us, and this report is one entirely made up in the chairman's office.

I wish to call attention particularly to the questions and answers that would appear to have been brought out in the committee. Every one of the letters to which the gentleman referred, particularly the letter in question and answer form from Professor Morison, were in answer to a letter the chairman of the committee wrote to these various persons, they not appearing at a hearing. I do not believe it is a very good way to carry on a discussion like this to simply quote from letters that may come in, particularly when it would appear as though they were a part of a hearing of a committee.

It is somewhat surprising that this measure should be brought up today under a rule. One June 5 the Speaker recognized the Chairman of the Library Committee to move to suspend the rules and pass this bill. The motion failed to carry by the necessary two-thirds vote. It would seem that that expression of the House would have convinced the proponents of the measure that Congress was in no way enthusiastic about having the so-called Roosevelt Library become a reality. So, I trust that the House today will again show its lack of sympathy with this effort to aggrandize and memorialize a living man and again vote not to accept the gift this bill suggests.

I want to discuss the question from two angles; first, the background under which this bill is before us, and, second, the merits of the proposition.

This measure passed the Senate without a word of debate, without any consideration, and without even a hearing before a Senate committee. Comment upon this procedure is unnecessary. To the best of my knowledge the bill was never before the House Committee on the Library and no hearing was held upon it. In spite of this fact, we have here a very elaborate report alleged to have been made under authority of the committee. The chairman is a good soldier, and goes along as directed by the administration. He has a very wide imagination to assume the committee authorized the bill to be reported or approved the report prepared at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Now permit me to make reference to the bill itself. In exchange for 12 acres of land in the village of Hyde Park, N. Y., it pledges the faith of the Federal Government to maintain a building not yet constructed and pay all maintenance costs until the end of time. It conveys the unheard-of authority of Congress to charge an admission of 25 cents to the land area and a further admission charge of 25 cents to the

hallowed building itself. I know of no Government property, entirely owned by the people of this country, to which Congress has authorized an admission charge, and we are all aware of the protest which is being raised against the unauthorized charges recently levied by the Secretary of the Interior for admission to Ford's Theater, the Peterson House, to Fort McHenry, and to the Lee Mansion in Arlington. Incidentally, I am informed that these unauthorized admission charges to these national shrines have already resulted in a marked falling off in the number of visitors. Congress never intended that admission should be charged to national shrines, and certainly we should not set such a precedent in this case.

On page 15 of the alleged report of the House Library Committee there appears an article from the New York Herald Tribune of February 5, 1939, headed "Drive Started for Roosevelt Library Fund." The article says that at a dinner in the Carleton Hotel, which the President attended, Mr. Frank C. Walker was named chairman of the committee to raise funds to erect on the President's estate at Hyde Park a repository for his State papers, correspondence, and private libraries. It is interesting to note that Mr. Walker, a former Montana lawyer, was at one time treasurer of the Democratic National Committee. An indication of the reception Mr. Walker's drive is meeting in his own State is contained in a dispatch from the Detroit Free Press' Washington bureau under date of July 3, 1939. It refers to the vigorous protest of Mr. O. S. Warden, of Great Falls, Mont., a member of the Democratic National Committee, whose friends quote him as saying:

This is the last straw. It is bad enough to meet repeated demands for the Democratic National Committee, but when it comes to soliciting money for the Roosevelt memorial I'm ready to quit.

If the State papers, correspondence, and private libraries of Mr. Roosevelt are of such great value and interest to the people, there is only one proper repository for them, and that is the National Capital, where there is ample room for their proper display and preservation, and not in an out-of-the-way village near Poughkeepsie, N. Y. Such portion of these documents as pertain to Mr. Roosevelt's services as Governor of New York could well be donated, should he so desire, to the State of New York. The portion having to do with his two terms as President of the United States could well be cared for in Washington where there is ample room in the new addition to the Library of Congress and in The Archives Building. Here they would be accessible to the public for inspection or to students of history in future years. Washington is the national repository, and one would needs be a most enthusiastic student or research worker to go to the village of Hyde Park to inspect such a relatively small portion of our national history.

Again, the bill practically sets up a branch office of the Archivist, who will be called upon to maintain a staff at Hyde Park, besides imposing upon the Treasury Department the added duty of carrying a new account upon its books.

On page 4 of the alleged report, in its final argument in support of the proposition, it is stated that Hyde Park is located on one of the most heavily traveled post roads in the country. This no doubt is true at this moment, but upon the completion of the new superhighway between New York and Albany, already half finished, the use of the post road will be confined principally to local and truck traffic. I may add that the new highway runs nowhere near Hyde Park.

I am confident that I voice the sentiment of a vast majority of the American people when I say that the public papers of all Presidents, and of all other public servants for that matter, should be filed in Washington, where suitable provision has been made for their exhibition and their preservation.

I have mentioned a few of the objections to this bill. There are many others. There is absolutely no valid argument for it except that of the personal aggrandizement of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and if for no other reason this should be sufficient to defeat it. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.



I am sorry my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts, was not present when we had the actual hearing on this matter. He is, however, a very important—and I speak seriously—Member of this House, and a member of a number of very important committees. Although he has attended as often as any man could under the circumstances, he has not always been present when we have been compelled to carry on the business of the Library Committee.

We had a hearing for 2 hours one morning, and after we had discussed the matter thoroughly we decided that the best way of getting the information before the House was to proceed in the following way: If you will refer to the printed hearings you will find they are a matter-of-fact presentation of the events as they transpired. At the top of page 17 you will find the following letter, which, with a copy of the resolution, House Joint Resolution 268, was sent to the persons who had attended a luncheon, at which plans for this action were fully discussed. These persons were present because they knew much about the subjects involved. The letter went to other leading authorities in the fields of historical research, economics, and government. This is the letter I wrote:

Your interest in the subject covered by the enclosed bill has come to my attention.

I should very much appreciate any statement you care to make for the record concerning the need, advisability, and desirability of this project. Your reply will be kept as a part of the official record concerning the development of this project.

Very cordially yours,

KENT E. KELLER, *Chairman.*

On page 14 you will find the list of those at the luncheon, persons high in the scholastic as well as in the economic world.

These authorities answered as shown in the appendix of the hearings. This is my judgment, and the judgment of the members of the committee present at that time, was the best way of getting the information before this body. All of those who have read the report and read the specific questions that Professor Morison put to himself and his answers have a perfectly clear understanding of what we are really driving at. All we are doing here is attempting to accept under such conditions as are acceptable to the President of the United States the first and only complete and entire collection of Presidential papers we have ever had the opportunity of securing.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. The burden of the objections we have heard today seems to be that this offer comes from a man who is still living, and for that reason we ought not to accept it. May I ask the gentleman if it is not his opinion that if Herbert Hoover, the only living ex-President of the United States, were willing to make an identical offer insofar as it were possible to do so, the Members on this side of the House would support it and vote to accept such an offer?

Mr. KELLER. I wish to answer the gentleman by saying that in my judgment the Library Committee would unquestionably report with exactly the same favor with respect to the Herbert Hoover Presidential papers that we have reported with regard to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential papers, and I believe this House would accept such an offer in the same way. As a challenge, I suggest to the gentlemen on the other side, if they believe we are not sincere in this statement, that they get Mr. Hoover to make a proposal exactly like Franklin D. Roosevelt's offer and see how quickly we accept it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc.—*

#### TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. As used in this joint resolution—

(a) The term "donor" means Franklin D. Roosevelt.

(b) The term "historical material" includes books, correspondence, papers, pamphlets, works of art, models, pictures, photographs, plats, maps, and other similar material.

(c) The term "Board" means the Trustees of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.

#### TITLE II—FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT LIBRARY

SEC. 201. The Archivist of the United States is authorized to accept for and in the name of the United States from the donor, or from such person or persons as shall be empowered to act for the donor, title to a tract of land consisting of an area of 12 acres, more or less, of the Hyde Park estate of the donor and his family, located on the New York-Albany Post Road, in the town of Hyde Park, Dutchess County, State of New York; such area to be selected and carved out of the said estate by the donor and to be utilized as a site for the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library provided for in this title.

SEC. 202. The Archivist is authorized to permit the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Inc., a New York corporation organized for that purpose, to construct on the area referred to in section 201 of this title a building, or buildings, to be designated as the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, and to landscape the grounds within the said area. Such project shall be carried out in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Archivist. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to permit the facilities and personnel of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department to be utilized in the preparation of plans for and in the construction and equipping of the project: *Provided*, That the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Inc., shall enter into an arrangement satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse the said Procurement Division for the costs and expenses incurred for such purposes, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 20, strike out "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert in lieu thereof "Federal Works Administration."

Page 2, line 22, strike out "Procurement Division of the Treasury Department" and insert "Public Building Administration."

Page 3, line 3, strike out "Procurement Division" and insert "Public Building Administration."

Page 3, line 5, strike out "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert "Federal Works Administration."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 203. Upon the completion of the project authorized in section 202 of this title, the Archivist shall accept for the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, as a gift from the donor, such collection of historical material as shall be donated by the donor. The Archivist may also acquire for the said library from other sources, by gift, purchase, or loan, historical books related to and other historical material contemporary with and related to the historical material acquired from the donor. The historical material acquired under this section shall be permanently housed in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library: *Provided*, That the Archivist may temporarily remove any of such material from the said library when he deems it to be necessary: *And provided further*, That the Archivist may dispose of any duplicate printed material in the said library by sale or exchange, and, with the approval of The National Archives Council, may dispose of by sale, exchange, or otherwise any material in the said library which appears to have no permanent value or historical interest. The proceeds of any sale made under this section shall be paid into the special account provided for in subsection (d) of section 205 of this title, to be held, administered, and expended in accordance with the provisions of that subsection.

SEC. 204. The faith of the United States is pledged that, upon the construction of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library and the acquisition from the donor of the collection of historical material in accordance with the terms of this title, the United States will provide such funds as may be necessary for the upkeep of the said library and the administrative expenses and costs of operation thereof, including the preservation and care of historical material acquired under this title, so that the said library shall be at all times properly maintained.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: Page 4, beginning in line 4, strike out all of section 204.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about the generosity of the donor of the library. It seems to me that a very uncertain charge is being placed upon the taxpayers of the country in the upkeep of this library and therefore there should be no reference made, as I see it, in the measure to the support of the library and the maintenance thereof by the Government unless there is a very definite statement as to the amount involved. The bill pledges the faith of the United States to eternity in the upkeep of this particular building and the contents thereof, as well as the maintenance of the grounds surrounding it.

If this is to be a generous donation by friends of the President and of the President himself, maintenance should be provided for and the taxpayers of the country should not be asked to support the building and maintain the grounds

in as inaccessible a location as Hyde Park will be when the new main thoroughfare from Albany to New York is completed. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], living in that neighborhood, described the inaccessibility of Hyde Park, and this will be accentuated when the new road, which is now half-way finished, is completed.

It seems to me that in view of the great spirit of generosity about which we have heard so much today there should be provision made for maintenance and upkeep.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts is aware of the fact that there are many public memorials to our great men, but that they are not maintained by the Federal Government. Recently I visited the memorial erected to the memory of President McKinley at Canton, Ohio, and although it is a beautiful memorial, it is in a sad state of repair. They cannot get one dime from the Federal Government to keep up a memorial that already exists.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Of course, if you were not going to pass this bill or if you were going to strike the enacting clause out later, it would be all right to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts; but if the bill is going to pass, this property is to become the property of the United States, and there is no fund anywhere in perpetuity that is big enough to raise this much money to maintain it, then certainly this amendment should not be adopted.

The Federal Government, in respect of all of its properties that I know anything about, pledges itself for its maintenance and the section which the gentleman from Massachusetts has moved to strike out simply provides for the maintenance of Federal property.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words in order to inquire of the gentleman from Texas who maintains Mount Vernon, the shrine of George Washington?

Mr. RAYBURN. The 25 cents that the people pay to go in there maintains Mount Vernon, and Mount Vernon is not the property of the United States. It belongs to the Ladies' Association of Mount Vernon.

Mr. LUCE. Then we shall make a distinction between the present occupant of the White House and the first occupant of the White House?

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts, for whom I have such a deep feeling of respect and regard, will wipe that question out of the RECORD, seeking to make a distinction between the first President of the United States and the present President. The Mount Vernon property does not belong to the Government of the United States at all. It is a private institution.

Mr. LUCE. I will, however, not withdraw my statement, but will add to it, who maintains Monticello?

Mr. RAYBURN. The 50 cents that the people pay to go in to see it, and that property does not belong to the Government of the United States, I will say to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. FISH: Page 4, line 13, after the word "maintained", strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: *Provided*, That not more than \$12,000 shall be expended annually.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I hope we can consider this regardless of party views no matter how our votes may be determined on the final passage of the bill. Section 204, page 4 of the bill, which we are discussing, reads as follows:

Sec. 204. The faith of the United States is pledged that, upon the construction of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library and the acqui-

sition from the donor of the collection of historical material in accordance with the terms of this title, the United States will provide such funds as may be necessary for the upkeep of the said library and the administrative expenses and costs of operation thereof, including the preservation and care of historical material acquired under this title, so that the said library shall be at all times properly maintained.

There is absolutely no limitation whatever in this bill as to the cost of maintenance of this library. I have heard it said on what I believe good authority that it may cost over \$100,000 a year to maintain this little library at Hyde Park, a library that is to contain the official papers of the President of the United States. I have tried to make it very clear why I am opposed to this on three grounds. First, it is an unholy precedent. It takes away from Washington and from the Congressional Library these papers that ought to be there and we by our approval help to send them to Hyde Park. In the next place, it costs money. The money comes out of the Government of the United States. In the third place, it is a monument to be erected to a living man. Putting aside those fundamental reasons why we are opposing this, we ought not to give carte blanche, we ought not to propose in this bill that they may spend any sum they desire—\$100,000, \$200,000, \$300,000—even more than the cost of the construction of the building, to maintain it. It is not sound or wise or proper legislation for the Congress of the United States to write into a bill—no limitation whatever. So I am offering this amendment limiting the maintenance to \$12,000 a year.

Certainly that is an ample sum, if we are simply to maintain that library for President Roosevelt's papers, and he can hire a librarian and a couple of assistants and a guard or two. There are ample funds for that in \$12,000; but if you think they are going to buy other papers, and are going to establish another congressional library, then I say pass this bill without any limit whatever. As far as I am concerned, I think this is a very proper and necessary amendment, regardless of partisan or party affiliations. It limits the total appropriation to \$12,000. Is not that enough for this library, regardless of our opposition on this side to it upon three different grounds? I am not pleading on those grounds now. I am pleading for a limitation to be written into the bill; and if Members of Congress on the Democratic side want to take the responsibility in the face of a deficit of three and a half billion dollars, then the responsibility is theirs. Put no limit on it at all, and then somebody will come in in some future Congress and instead of having 4 or 5 you will have 40 employees, and instead of spending \$12,000, more than likely you will be called upon to appropriate \$100,000. There is no limitation here, and knowing how people act when there is no limitation upon spending—whether they be Democrats or Republicans—we should fix a limit, else we will have a white elephant on our hands, with no restriction placed on those in charge, who will come back here and ask for unprecedented sums of money.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. Not only in section 204 on page 4 does it say that the United States shall provide such funds as may be necessary for the upkeep of said library and the administrative expenses and cost of operation thereof, including the preservation and care of historical material, but in section 206, on page 7, it provides that the Commissioner of Public Buildings shall be responsible for the care, maintenance, and protection of the buildings and grounds of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, and that except as provided in that sentence I have just read, the immediate custody and control of the library—

And such other buildings, grounds, and equipment as may from time to time become a part thereof, and their contents, shall be vested in the Archivist of the United States.

Mr. FISH. In the name of common sense and the Treasury of the United States I ask that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I oppose this, Mr. Chairman, primarily on the same ground as I opposed the last amendment. I do not know of any bill



that Congress has ever passed acquiring property where a limit on expenditures for upkeep was set. If there has ever been a thing like that done I would like to have some Member of the House call it to my attention.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] does not say "\$12,000." He says "not more than \$12,000." And always in the future, as in the past, the Congress will have the power to appropriate \$12,000 for maintenance, or nothing. If the parties should change, which I do not think they will judging from the actions that have been taken by the minority in the last few weeks, to say the least, they could refuse, and in all probability would refuse, to appropriate one red cent for this matter. But this is an unusual amendment. I never heard of one being offered before, where the Federal Government acquired title to property, where a limitation upon an appropriation like this was set out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FISH) there were—ayes 79, noes 118.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed Mr. KELLAR and Mr. FISH to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported there were—ayes 78, noes 118.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 205. (a) A Board to be known as the Trustees of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library is hereby established. The Archivist and the Secretary of the Treasury shall be ex officio members, and the Archivist shall be chairman of the Board. There shall also be five members of the Board appointed by the President for life, but the President may remove any such member for cause. Vacancies on the Board shall be filled by the President. Membership on the Board shall not be deemed to be an office within the meaning of the Constitution and statutes of the United States.

(b) No compensation shall be paid to the members of the Board for their services as such members, but they shall be allowed their necessary expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties under this title. The certificate of the chairman of the Board shall be sufficient evidence that the expenses are properly allowable.

(c) The Board is hereby authorized to accept and receive gifts and bequests of personal property and to hold and administer the same as trust funds for the benefit of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library. The moneys or securities composing trust funds given or bequeathed to the Board shall be receipted for by the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall invest, reinvest, and retain investments as the Board may from time to time determine: *Provided, however,* That the Board is not authorized to engage in any business nor to exercise any voting privilege which may be incidental to securities in such trust funds, nor shall the Secretary of the Treasury make any investments for the account of the Board which could not lawfully be made by a trust company in the District of Columbia, except that he may make any investment directly authorized by the instrument of gift under which the funds to be invested are derived and may retain any investments accepted by the Board.

(d) The income from any trust funds held by the Board, as and when collected, shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, who shall enter it in a special account to the credit of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library and subject to disbursement by the Archivist, except where otherwise restricted by the instrument of gift, in the purchase of equipment for the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library; in the preparation and publication of guides, inventories, calendars, and textual reproduction of material in the said library; and in the purchase, under section 203 of this title, of historical material for the said library. The Treasurer of the United States is hereby authorized to honor the requisitions of the Archivist made in such manner and in accordance with such regulations as the Treasurer may from time to time prescribe. The Archivist may make sales of any publications authorized by this section at a price which will cover their cost and 10 percent added, and all moneys received from such sales shall be paid into, administered, and expended as a part of the special account herein provided for.

(e) Unless otherwise restricted by the instrument of gift, the Board, by resolution duly adopted, may authorize the Archivist to use the principal of any gift or bequest made to it for any of the purposes mentioned in subsection (d) hereof.

(f) The Board shall have all the usual powers of a trustee in respect to all funds administered by it, but the members of the Board shall not be personally liable, except for misfeasance. In the administration of such trust funds the actions of the Board, including any payments made or authorized to be made by it from such funds, shall not be subject to review or attack except in an action brought in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, which is hereby given jurisdiction of such suits,

for the purpose of enforcing the provision of any trust accepted by the Board.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the section on the ground that it contains an appropriation of public funds and that it is reported by a committee not having jurisdiction to bring into the House an appropriation bill.

I call the attention of the Chair to the following language on page 6, in line 7:

The Treasurer of the United States is hereby authorized to honor the requisitions of the Archivist made in such manner and in accordance with such regulations as the Treasurer may from time to time prescribe.

Those words take money directly from the Treasury of the United States without any limitation and are in violation of the provisions of clause 4 of rule XXI of the House, which reads:

No bill or joint resolution carrying appropriations shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations, nor shall an amendment proposing an appropriation be in order during the consideration of a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee not having that jurisdiction. A question of order on an appropriation in any such bill, joint resolution, or amendment thereto may be raised at any time.

Now, this is a permanent appropriation which will go on forever of whatever amount the Archivist cares to draw for upon the Treasurer under such rules and regulations as the Treasurer may from time to time prescribe. I make the point of order against the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to direct a question to the gentleman from New York. In line 8, on page 6, is the gentleman of the opinion that the authorization there takes money from the United States Treasury or merely honors requisitions?

Mr. TABER. It authorizes the Treasurer of the United States, without any further legislation, to take money right out of the United States Treasury. It is a permanent appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KELLER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that the point of order is ill taken for this reason: This is not an appropriation. There is no appropriation provided in this at all. It is simply and solely for the purpose of accepting the requisitions of the proper authority in charge of all archives of all kinds and character, because this bill provides that the expense shall be appropriated for as a part of the Archivist's expenses to the Government as a whole.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that the language in the section provides for the creation of a trust fund to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States. It provides for the raising of a trust fund to be placed in the Treasury, and the language does not take appropriated money out of the Treasury. It is not out of Government funds, but out of the trust fund. It is not in itself a direct appropriation, but more of an authorization for those in charge to draw on the trust fund.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that there is no limitation on the funds that this should be taken out of. The way it reads it would be taken directly out of the Treasury and not out of any trust fund whatever. It does not say that it shall be taken out of a trust fund, nor is it implied in any way.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York limit his point of order to the sentence which he read?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I made the point of order against the section.

Mr. KELLER. Have you read what is at the bottom of page 5 as to the method of depositing the money in the Treasury first?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I have read that. There is nothing whatever that limits the amount that can be taken out to the amount that is put in, nor is there anything whatever that limits it to being taken out of that fund. It is direct authority to the Treasurer to pay it.

Mr. KELLER. Well, what is a requisition, then?

Mr. TABER. A requisition is a draft upon the Treasurer. This constitutes a permanent appropriation.

Mr. KELLER. Only where the money is already provided, not where it is not provided.

Mr. TABER. No; there is no such limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order made by the gentleman from New York against the section is well taken, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAYBURN: On page 4, after line 13, insert the following:

"Sec. 205. (a) A Board to be known as the Trustees of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library is hereby established. The Archivist and the Secretary of the Treasury shall be ex officio members, and the Archivist shall be chairman of the Board. There shall also be five members of the Board appointed by the President for life, but the President may remove any such member for cause. Vacancies on the Board shall be filled by the President. Membership on the Board shall not be deemed to be an office within the meaning of the Constitution and statutes of the United States.

"(b) No compensation shall be paid to the members of the Board for their services as such members, but they shall be allowed their necessary expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties under this title. The certificate of the chairman of the Board shall be sufficient evidence that the expenses are properly allowable.

"(c) The Board is hereby authorized to accept and receive gifts and bequests of personal property and to hold and administer the same as trust funds for the benefit of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library. The moneys or securities composing trust funds given or bequeathed to the Board shall be receipted for by the Secretary of the Treasury who shall invest, reinvest, and retain investments as the Board may from time to time determine: *Provided, however*, That the Board is not authorized to engage in any business nor to exercise any voting privilege which may be incidental to securities in such trust funds, nor shall the Secretary of the Treasury make any investments for the account of the Board which could not lawfully be made by a trust company in the District of Columbia, except that he may make any investment directly authorized by the instrument of gift under which the funds to be invested are derived, and may retain any investments accepted by the Board.

"(d) The income from any trust funds held by the Board, as and when collected, shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States who shall enter it in a special account to the credit of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library and subject to disbursement by the Archivist, except where otherwise restricted by the instrument of gift, in the purchase of equipment for the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library; in the preparation and publication of guides, inventories, calendars, and textual reproduction of material in the said library; and in the purchase, under section 203 of this title, of historical material for the said library. The Archivist may make sales of any publications authorized by this section at a price which will cover their cost and 10 percent added, and all moneys received from such sales shall be paid into, administered, and expended as a part of the special account herein provided for.

"(e) Unless otherwise restricted by the instrument of gift, the Board, by resolution duly adopted, may authorize the Archivist to use the principal of any gift or bequest made to it for any of the purposes mentioned in subsection (d) hereof.

"(f) The Board shall have all the usual powers of a trustee in respect to all funds administered by it, but the members of the Board shall not be personally liable, except for misfeasance. In the administration of such trust funds the actions of the Board, including any payments made or authorized to be made by it from such funds, shall not be subject to review or attack except in an action brought in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, which is hereby given jurisdiction of such suits, for the purpose of enforcing the provision of any trust accepted by the Board."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman tell us briefly what his amendment does?

Mr. RAYBURN. I may say to the gentleman from New York that I conceded that his point of order was good.

The amendment I offer leaves out the language objected to by the gentleman from New York in lines 7, 8, 9, and 10 on page 6, reading:

The Treasurer of the United States is hereby authorized to honor the requisitions of the Archivist made in such manner and in accordance with such regulations as the Treasurer may from time to time prescribe.

This undoubtedly meets the objection raised by the gentleman from New York, and I contend that the amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 206. The Director of the National Park Service shall be responsible for the care, maintenance, and protection of the buildings and grounds of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library in the same manner and to the same extent as he is responsible for the National Archives Building in the District of Columbia. Except as provided in the preceding sentence, the immediate custody and control of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, and such other buildings, grounds, and equipment as may from time to time become a part thereof, and their contents shall be vested in the Archivist of the United States, and he is authorized to appoint and prescribe the duties of such officers and employees, including clerical assistance for the Board, as may be necessary for the execution of the functions vested in him by this title.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 7, line 1, strike out "Director of the National Park Service" and insert in lieu thereof "Commissioner of Public Buildings."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 207. The Archivist shall prescribe regulations governing the arrangement, custody, protection, and use of the historical material acquired under this title; and, subject to such regulations, such material shall be available to the public free of charge: *Provided*, That the Archivist is authorized to charge and collect, under regulations prescribed by him, a fee not in excess of 25 cents per person for the privilege of visiting and viewing the exhibit rooms or museum portion of the said library; and any funds so derived shall be paid by the Archivist into the special account provided for in subsection (d) of section 205 of this title, to be held, administered, and expended under the provisions of that subsection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: Beginning on page 7, in line 24, with the word "*Provided*," and continuing through line 6, on page 8, strike out the proviso.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is very plain.

I am very much opposed to any collection being made of 25 cents per head for the privilege of visiting and viewing the exhibit rooms or museum portion of said library. It seems to me that if this library is to be supported by the taxpayers of the United States they certainly ought to have the privilege of seeing what they are paying taxes for. I cannot for the life of me understand why a charge should be made to go into this building. We have a very good illustration of what comes of trying to charge admission to buildings here in the city of Washington in the case of certain buildings under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, but that is done under regulations he has seen fit to make. This, however, amounts to taxation, for it is a charge prescribed in a law. I know of no law wherein an admission is charged to any public property of the United States. It seems to me to be degrading to the people to ask them to contribute 25 cents per capita to enter this particular building, and I trust that the amendment that I have offered will be adopted.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. DOWELL. There is an illustration of that right here in the Capitol, for everyone who enters the Capitol must pay 25 cents to go through the building, and that ought to be abolished.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman has made a very good suggestion. There is just as much sense in charging 25 cents to enter the Capitol Building as there is to enter these other buildings that have been paid for by the people. The provision I would strike out of the pending bill is even worse than that, for the people at this time know nothing about what they are going to be admitted to see. This supports the argument of the gentleman from Iowa that we ought not to charge admission to this Capitol or any public building here in Washington, and certainly we should not by law impose a charge for admission to a building not yet constructed.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. A moment ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish] offered an amendment which would have



limited the Government expenditure on this library to \$12,000 and no more, stating that he thought the Government ought not to pay anything on matters of this kind. The gentleman from Massachusetts now comes along and offers an amendment which would strike out the one provision of the bill which would help pay the expenses of this library.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not hesitate to say that I thoroughly approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. There should not be a greater charge than \$12,000 per year for the maintenance of that library; but the taxpayers of the country, having once made a payment of \$12,000, should not be taxed a second time for admission. That is a policy too small to be considered, and I am astonished that the gentleman from Texas, with his great fund of knowledge, information, and ability, should lower himself to the point of advocating a tax of 25 cents for admission to this building.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman is just for any small crippling amendment to this bill.

Mr. TREADWAY. No; I beg the gentleman's pardon. It is just the reverse. If the building is going to be constructed, and I realize it will be, in spite of the strong opposition that has been lodged here today, let us be dignified about this thing. When we get to the building, let us have something we will be proud of and not a dime museum.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is very apparent that the Democratic majority intends to accept this so-called gift and begin the erection of a monument to a living President, to be maintained at the expense of the taxpayers. It is the first time in the history of our country, so far as my knowledge goes, that a President thought it necessary, in order to perpetuate the memory of his administration to, during his lifetime, call for the use of Federal funds for the erection of a monument to himself.

Perhaps it is well, if the President must have a monument, that such a course be adopted, for monuments are not erected to perpetuate the memory of all Presidents. This monument is to take the form of a library where the precious private papers of the President and, perhaps, of other members of his family who are prolific writers for profit will be preserved for the coming generations. Inasmuch as the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] providing that the Federal contribution for the upkeep of this memorial be limited to \$12,000 per annum was voted down and as it now has been determined that the Federal Government is to take over the burden, whether the taxpayers desire it or not, of maintaining this edifice through the coming generations, the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] to the effect that we should strike from the bill the charge for admission for the privilege of seeing these historical documents would seem to be in order.

If the writings of this President or of members of his family, or the epistles received by him are of such transcendent value that they require during his lifetime the erection of a special building in which they may be safeguarded, it would be interesting to learn, if we may, from the members of the majority, whether all of the writings of the President and all of the resolutions, petitions, letters, memoranda, and chits received by him from various organizations and individuals during his tenure of office are to be included and preserved for posterity.

Well do I recall my extreme interest, when visiting Mount Vernon, in some of the letters received by Washington and in some of his replies. Especially those of a more intimate nature, for we all are concerned in what might be termed the little things which affect our daily lives. We are all interested in the domestic happenings, the little individual transactions, of the great and of the near great. Especially do I recall the great degree of interest with which I viewed the dental instruments used by Washington. As long as memory is mine I will see the wooden plugs which George Washington, the Father of our Country, was forced by the crudities of his generation to use as teeth.

The thought occurs now, Will this library safeguard and preserve for posterity all of those little intimate happenings which have, perhaps unconsciously, affected the life of our President? Many recall some of the old recipes which we find among the papers of some of our great men who have passed beyond; the descriptions of family dress in intimate letters or of family custom contained in intimate letters from one member of a family to another. Will future generations find in this library erected to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt the endorsement of a well-known brand of baking powder; will we find there a record of the sums paid members of the Roosevelt family for addresses, lectures, or writings; will we find there a history of the business transactions of the President's sons with little intimate comments of other members of the family? Will we find complete copies of the letters of the First Lady of the land as set forth in her column *My Day*? Will we find in this so-called library the evidence which shows that the Workers Alliance is controlled and its policy dictated by Communists, and following that, will there appear the copy of the address of the First Lady to a recent gathering of the Workers Alliance?

Will we find among these precious papers the resolutions of the Joint Committee for the Defense of American Ideals, signed by the leaders of 21 of the 23 organizations which bolted the American Youth Congress because that Congress refused to condemn communism? Attached to those resolutions will we find the address of the First Lady of the Land, delivered to that organization which is charged with fostering, with failing to condemn communism? Will we find in that edifice among the President's state papers his endorsement for a third term as President written by Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party in America? In connection with this document, will we find that communication put out in Michigan supporting Maurice Sugar, one of the leading attorneys for the C. I. O., and supporting Murphy, the President's personal friend, his choice for Governor of Michigan, his choice for Attorney General of these United States? Will that document contain, so that posterity may read and learn, this appeal made in that circular in that election, and which reads:

To all who hate the smug priests of the Catholic Church, and the slimy hypocritical ministers of the Protestant churches; \* \* \* to all who are opposed by this damnable Government, we address this message. Vote for our candidate (Maurice Sugar).

I quote further:

Close the churches and make those buildings into shelters for homeless men and women. Down with religion, which is opium which the ruling class feeds you to keep you satisfied with the miserable existence which you lead. There is no God.

Will that collection of papers contain a repudiation by the President of the support of the Communists? Will there appear among those documents a letter written by the President condemning the teachings of the Communists as set forth in the foregoing quotation? Such condemnation has not yet appeared in the public press, so far as I have been able to learn, nor has there been any intimation anywhere from the President's bosom friend, Attorney General Murphy, showing that he, while Governor, repudiated the political support of the Communists and their allies.

We know today that the United Mine Workers contributed \$470,000 toward the election of the President in the 1936 campaign. Will that fact be set forth among these papers? Will there be a copy of the President's reply, if any was made, to that generous gift? Will there be in that vast collection a copy of any letter written to Murphy while he was Governor of Michigan calling attention to the fact that civil liberties were being denied to hundreds of men and women who were willing to work, but who were denied that privilege by the Governor of Michigan, the President's friend? In this great collection, will there be any letter or any statement by the President condemning the use for political purposes of money appropriated to relieve the needy, the starving, those suffering from cold and from lack of food? We, now here on this earth, know how vast sums were diverted from the needy and used to corrupt the voters. Will these papers and writings of the President tell us when and where he condemned

that practice? Will there be a record of letters written by him to his intimate, powerful political supporters asking them to repudiate, to prevent that misuse of public funds? Will there be an explanation of why the President wrote his name in the Democratic campaign books which were sold to corporations for as much as \$50 each?

Oh, the inquiries might be extended indefinitely, but the foregoing is sufficient to give an idea of how valuable such a collection will be if it contains not a part, but all of the papers showing the record of the President, Roosevelt.

Turning now to another phase of the debate, let me express my great admiration for the ability of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] who, on one occasion this afternoon, said that he possessed the power of imagination. I think all of us can agree that he possesses that power in an almost unlimited degree. He certainly uses his imagination when he describes the greatness of his President. No doubt he is correct when he complains that we on the Republican side find altogether too much fault with the President and his policies. It may be true that some of us over on this side can see little or no good in most of the things that the President has advocated and brought about. It may be equally true that the gentlemen on the other side, and especially the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], have gone to the other extreme and now, if I may use the term, almost worship at the feet of the man in the White House. The alacrity with which some on that side do his bidding would indicate that they believe him incapable of error. The meekness with which they turn the other cheek indicates not a lack of spirit but an abiding love for the hand that smites, the foot that boots. This thought rose out of the fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has on two or three occasions criticized the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKE] and some others on this side when they ventured to criticize the President, who, it sometimes almost seems, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] regards as an idol.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman from Texas did not criticize the gentleman from Montana. He was criticizing certain material that was being put in the RECORD, which was conducive to racial hatred.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is right in one particular. The gentleman from Texas did not criticize the gentleman from Montana. He just criticized what he said; that is all. He wanted to deny to the gentleman the right to express on the floor of the Congress his opinion.

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, no.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Because those views were in conflict with the views of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman is entirely wrong.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], I repeat, was correct in one particular. He did not criticize the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKE] because of his personal appearance. He did not criticize the gentleman's necktie, his clothes, or the manner in which he combed his hair. Perhaps he did not criticize him because he was finding fault with the President and with some of the President's associates. What the gentleman from Texas did do was to criticize the conduct of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKE] in putting into the RECORD some of the things that the gentleman from Montana desired to insert therein. Whether we agree with the views of the gentleman from Texas or with those of the gentleman from Montana is a question for each individual, but ill will be the day when it is the practice of this House to prevent any Member criticizing an Executive, the associates of that Executive, or his administrative acts. We on this side find no fault—at least I know of no one who finds any fault—because the gentleman from Texas and some others on the majority side have reached that apparent state of mind where they think the President can do no wrong.

Where they apparently accept unquestioned, or at least make no audible protest, when the President receives, or at least does not repudiate, the political support of those at the

head of an organization which advocates the overthrow of our Government by force. For myself, the right is reserved to think as my intelligence and my judgment, if any, guide me and to exercise, so long as our Constitution endures, the right of free speech on the floor of the House, doing so with charity for the views of all, insisting, however, that each Member of the House may use his constitutional right unhampered, unrestricted, so long as he confines himself to parliamentary language to express his views. If that privilege once be denied to the humblest Member of this House, to the most lowly citizen of our Commonwealth, then, indeed, may the President, by the use of the vast sums granted to him, by the exercise of that unlimited authority which the majority Members of this House have seen fit to vest in him, go on not only to a third term but to that position where he may name his successor. Yes; it is well for history at least that the papers of the President and of those who associate with him be preserved, so that in the future those who follow us in our brief sojourn here on earth may learn of the steps by which Franklin Delano Roosevelt succeeded or failed in his attempt to remake our form of government, to establish himself as a dictator over these free United States of America.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, we are asked to spend some \$300,000 for the construction of a library, which may not be a lot of money, but I cannot see why the President would not veto this bill if the House of Representatives and the Senate pass it. I want to refer back to a statement made by the President at Sioux City, Iowa, on September 29, 1932, as follows:

I shall use this position of high responsibility to discuss up and down the country, at all seasons, at all times, the duty of reducing taxes, of increasing the efficiency of government, of cutting out the underbrush around our governmental structure, of getting the most public service for every dollar paid by taxation. This I pledge you and nothing I have said in the campaign transcends in importance this covenant with the taxpayers of this country.

After the President of the United States made that pointed statement on economy, what has transpired since that time? Now, the Members of Congress want to build a library at Hyde Park that will cost \$300,000 when we have an Archives Building down here, or a public library, which would be glad to accept these papers. I feel confident that the President of the United States will veto this bill, if he is a man of his word. Why would he want to go ahead and spend this money to build a library when it is not necessary? Why would he permit the Members of this Congress to pass such a bill? I do not think he will do this.

Let me quote again from what the President said in his message to Congress of March 10, 1933, as follows:

For 3 long years the Federal Government has been on the road toward bankruptcy. \* \* \*

With the utmost seriousness I point out to the Congress the profound effect of this fact upon our national economy. \* \* \*

Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on rocks of loose fiscal policy. We must avoid this danger.

Let us see just what our position is today. We have had 6 long years of the Roosevelt dynasty. Let me refer to the Federal Government financial statement when he took office in 1933, at which time we had a national indebtedness of only about \$19,000,000,000.

Let us see where we are today. I have here the statement of July 10, 1939, published by Mr. Morgenthau, the Secretary of the Treasury. This statement shows we are now \$40,587,024,737.12 in the red. This is Mr. Morgenthau's statement of the condition of the Treasury, and Mr. Morgenthau is Mr. Roosevelt's Secretary of the Treasury. This shows an increase in the national debt of over \$20,000,000,000 in 6 years, or more than \$2,750,000,000 annually.

It is a terrible condition in which we find ourselves, after the President promised economy; and now you are going to drive down his throat a further expenditure of \$300,000 for a library, when you have built more libraries and public schools in the last 6 years than we ever built before in the history of this Nation. If the President of the United States backs



up on the statements he has made, as I have quoted them, and they are his actual words, it will be just too bad.

Our Speaker has had a week's vacation, and we are glad to see him back. I should like to have him take the position here on the floor of this House of trying to get this Congress to stop spending, spending, spending money, the result of which will be that some day either the taxpayers of this country will have to pay these debts out of their hard-earned dollars and by the sweat of their brow or we shall repudiate our debts; and if we do repudiate our debts, we shall lose our present form of government and fall under a dictatorship.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TREADWAY) there were—ayes 91, noes 140.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 208. The Archivist shall make to the Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, a report for the preceding fiscal year as to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library. Such report shall include a detailed statement of all accessions, all dispositions of historical material, and all receipts and expenditures on account of the said library.

SEC. 209. The costs incurred by the Archivist in carrying out the duties placed upon him by this title, including the expenses of the members of the Board and the costs of the Board's necessary clerical assistance, shall be paid out of the appropriations for The National Archives Establishment as other costs and expenses of The National Archives Establishment are paid; and such sums as may be necessary for such purposes are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

#### TITLE III—FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT RESIDENCE

SEC. 301. The head of any executive department, pursuant to agreement between him and the donor, may accept for and in the name of the United States from the donor or from such person or persons as shall be empowered to act for the donor, title to any part or parts of the said Hyde Park estate of the donor and his family which shall be donated to the United States for use in connection with any designated function of the Government administered in such department. The title to any such property may be accepted under this section notwithstanding that it may be subject to the life estate of the donor or of any other person or persons now living: *Provided*, That during the continuance of any life estate reserved therein no expense to the United States in connection with the ordinary maintenance of the property so acquired shall be incurred: *Provided further*, That the acceptance hereunder by the United States of the title to property in which any life estate is reserved shall not during the existence of such life estate exempt the property, except to the extent provided in section 304 of this title, from taxation by the town of Hyde Park, Dutchess County, or the State of New York as other real property in the said town, county, or State is taxed under the applicable laws relating to taxation of real property.

SEC. 302. Upon the expiration of all life estates reserved in any property acquired under this title for use in connection with a designated function of the Government, or, if no life estate is reserved, immediately upon the acceptance of title thereto, the head of the department administering the said function shall assume jurisdiction and control over the property so acquired and administer it for the purpose designated, subject to the applicable provisions of law.

SEC. 303. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the head of any department exercising jurisdiction and control over any property acquired under this title shall be authorized to charge and collect, under regulations prescribed by him, a fee not in excess of 25 cents per person for the privilege of visiting and viewing the said property, and any funds thus derived shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of a special fund, and shall be available, when appropriated by the Congress, for expenditure in the upkeep, maintenance, protection, and preservation of any property acquired under this title.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: On page 10, strike out lines 3 to 13, inclusive.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment to strike out section 303 is to eliminate the admission charge of 25 cents per person "for the privilege of visiting and viewing the said property." You have already passed on the question of charging an admission fee of 25 cents to the building. A visitor paying that charge will also be charged 25 cents to visit and view the property; in other words, by the time the visitor gets into the library itself he will have paid a 50-cent fee for that privilege.

Mr. Chairman, some of the most beautiful estates in the United States are in the district I have the honor to represent. People tour through the Berkshires and western Massachusetts not alone for the purpose of seeing the scenery but to see the magnificent estates that are maintained in that area. Who ever heard of the owner of one of these estates charging a fee for so much as looking over his hedge, for instance, to see the beautiful grounds, the flowers, and the house itself? There is no more reason for an admission fee to be charged to the grounds wherein the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library will be constructed than there is to charge admission to estates throughout the Berkshires and other areas of New England.

I cannot conceive of anything more undignified than to ask a taxpayer of the United States to pay 25 cents to go through the gate of the residence of the President of the United States, even though later on it should become the property of the United States itself. Let us at least be a little dignified in dealing with this proposition and not make it a dime-museum proposition, charging admission not only to the building but to the grounds as well.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman recall that on entering these grounds one can look across the river and see the kingdom of Father Divine? Perhaps that is why the charge is made.

Mr. TREADWAY. There is enough objection to the proposition itself without crossing the Hudson River to find anything further.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I wish to say that as far as I am concerned—

Mr. TREADWAY. You will pay 50 cents.

Mr. RAYBURN. And I do not speak for anybody but myself over here. I should like to see the gentleman's amendment adopted.

Mr. TREADWAY. I thank the gentleman. I believe it ought to be adopted.

Mr. RAYBURN. I say that because this is another section of the bill and imposes an additional charge of 25 cents to get on the premises.

Mr. TREADWAY. In other words, the gentleman is in agreement with the argument I am making, that it would cost 50 cents to get on the property and into the library, too.

Mr. RAYBURN. I am afraid so.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 304. The right is reserved in the Congress to take such action and to make such changes, modifications, alterations, and improvements in connection with and upon any property acquired under this title, during or after the expiration of any life estate reserved therein, as the Congress shall deem proper and necessary to protect and preserve the same; but neither the improvements so made nor any increase in the value of the property by reason thereof shall be subject to taxation during the existence of any life estate reserved in the property.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOEHNE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 118) to provide for the establishment and maintenance of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 238, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment; if not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. FISH. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FISH moves to recommit Senate Joint Resolution 118 to the Committee on the Library with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 4, line 13, after the word "maintained", strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That not more than \$12,000 shall be expended annually."

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 132, nays 219, not voting 77, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—132

Alexander	Engel	Keefe	Routzohn
Allen, Ill.	Englebright	Kinzer	Rutherford
Andersen, H. Carl	Fenton	Knutson	Sandager
Anderson, Calif.	Fish	Lambertson	Schafer, Wis.
Angell	Ford, Leland M.	Landis	Schiffler
Arends	Gamble	LeCompte	Secombe
Austin	Gartner	Lewis, Ohio	Seger
Ball	Gerlach	Luce	Shafer, Mich.
Barton	Gleicher	McLean	Short
Bates, Mass.	Gillie	McLeod	Simpson
Bender	Graham	Mapes	Smith, Maine
Blackney	Gross	Marshall	Springer
Bolles	Gwynne	Martin, Iowa	Stefan
Brewster	Halleck	Martin, Mass.	Sumner, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Hancock	Mason	Taber
Carlson	Harness	Michener	Talle
Carter	Harter, N. Y.	Monkiewicz	Thill
Chilperfield	Hawks	Mott	Thorkelson
Church	Helme	Mundt	Tibbott
Clason	Hess	Murray	Tinkham
Clevenger	Hinshaw	O'Brien	Treadway
Corbett	Hoffman	Oliver	Van Zandt
Crawford	Hope	Osmer	Vorys, Ohio
Crowther	Horton	Pierce, N. Y.	Vreeland
Curtis	Jarrett	Powers	Wadsworth
Darrow	Jenkins, Ohio	Reed, Ill.	Wheat
Dirksen	Jenks, N. H.	Reed, N. Y.	White, Ohio
Ditter	Jensen	Rees, Kans.	Wigglesworth
Dondero	Johns	Rich	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Johnson, Ill.	Robison, Ky.	Winter
Dowell	Johnson, Ind.	Rockefeller	Wolcott
Dworshak	Jones, Ohio	Rodgers, Pa.	Woodruff, Mich.
Elston	Kean	Rogers, Mass.	Youngdahl

NAYS—219

Allen, La.	Cole, Md.	Fries	Jones, Tex.
Allen, Pa.	Cole, N. Y.	Fulmer	Keller
Anderson, Mo.	Collins	Garrett	Kennedy, Martin
Arnold	Colmer	Gathings	Kennedy, Md.
Ashbrook	Cooley	Gavagan	Kennedy, Michael
Barden	Costello	Gearhart	Keogh
Barnes	Creal	Gehrmann	Kerr
Barry	Crosser	Geyer, Calif.	Kilday
Bates, Ky.	Crowe	Gibbs	Kitchens
Beam	Cullen	Gossett	Kleberg
Beckworth	D'Alesandro	Green	Kocalkowski
Bell	Darden	Gregory	Kramer
Boehne	Delaney	Griffith	Kunkel
Boland	Dempsey	Hall	Lanham
Boren	DeRouen	Hare	Lea
Boykin	Dickstein	Harrington	Leavy
Bradley, Pa.	Dingell	Hart	Lemke
Brooks	Disney	Harter, Ohio	Lesinski
Brown, Ga.	Doughton	Havener	Lewis, Colo.
Bryson	Doxey	Healey	Ludlow
Buck	Drewry	Hendricks	McAndrews
Buckler, Minn.	Duncan	Hennings	McArdle
Burch	Dunn	Hill	McGehee
Burdick	Durham	Hobbs	McGranery
Burgin	Eberharter	Hook	McKeough
Byron	Elliott	Houston	McLaughlin
Caldwell	Ellis	Hull	McMillan, John L.
Cannon, Fla.	Faddis	Hunter	Mahon
Cannon, Mo.	Fay	Izac	Maloney
Cartwright	Flaherty	Jacobsen	Mansfield
Chapman	Flannagan	Jarman	Marcantonio
Clark	Folger	Johnson, Lyndon	Martin, Colo.
Cochran	Ford, Miss.	Johnson, Okla.	Martin, Ill.
Coffee, Nebr.	Ford, Thomas F.	Johnson, W. Va.	Massingale

May	Patton	Satterfield	Tenerowicz
Miller	Peterson, Fla.	Schaefer, Ill.	Terry
Mills, Ark.	Peterson, Ga.	Schuetz	Thomas, Tex.
Mills, La.	Pfeifer	Schulte	Tolan
Monroney	Pierce, Oreg.	Schwert	Vincent, Ky.
Moser	Pittenger	Scruggam	Vinson, Ga.
Mouton	Poage	Sheppard	Voorhis, Calif.
Murdock, Ariz.	Polk	Sirovich	Walgren
Murdock, Utah	Ramspeck	Smith, Va.	Walter
Myers	Randolph	Smith, Wash.	Ward
Nelson	Rankin	Smith, W. Va.	Warren
Nichols	Rayburn	Snyder	Weaver
Norrell	Reece, Tenn.	South	Welch
O'Connor	Robertson	Sparkman	West
O'Day	Robinson, Utah	Spence	Whelchel
O'Leary	Rogers, Okla.	Starnes, Ala.	Whittington
O'Neal	Romjue	Steagall	Williams, Mo.
Pace	Ryan	Sullivan	Wolverton, N. J.
Parsons	Sabath	Sutphin	Wood
Patman	Sacks	Sweeney	Zimmerman
Patrick	Sasscer	Tarver	

NOT VOTING—77

Andresen, A. H.	Cox	Jeffries	Risk
Andrews	Culkin	Johnson, Luther A.	Secrest
Bland	Cummings	Kee	Shanley
Bloom	Curley	Kelly	Shannon
Bolton	Dies	Kirwan	Smith, Conn.
Bradley, Mich.	Eaton, Calif.	Larrabee	Smith, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Eaton, N. J.	McCormack	Smith, Ohio
Bulwinkle	Edmiston	McDowell	Somers, N. Y.
Byrne, N. Y.	Evans	McMillan, Thos. S.	Stearns, N. H.
Byrns, Tenn.	Ferguson	Maas	Summers, Tex.
Case, S. Dak.	Fernandez	Maclejewski	Taylor, Colo.
Casey, Mass.	Fitzpatrick	Magnuson	Taylor, Tenn.
Celler	Flannery	Merritt	Thomas, N. J.
Chandler	Gifford	Mitchell	Thomason
Claypool	Gore	Norton	White, Idaho
Cluett	Grant, Ala.	O'Toole	Wolfenden, Pa.
Coffee, Wash.	Grant, Ind.	Pearson	Woodrum, Va.
Connery	Guyer, Kans.	Plumley	
Cooper	Hartley	Rabaut	
Courtney	Holmes	Richards	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Plumley (for) with Mr. Cooper (against).  
 Mr. Smith of Ohio (for) with Mr. Ferguson (against).  
 Mr. Bradley of Michigan (for) with Mr. Kee (against).  
 Mr. Cluett (for) with Mr. O'Toole (against).  
 Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Coffee of Washington (against).  
 Mr. Jeffries (for) with Mr. Larrabee (against).  
 Mr. Gifford (for) with Mr. Bloom (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Bland with Mr. Eaton of New Jersey.  
 Mr. Thomas S. McMillan with Mr. Bolton.  
 Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Holmes.  
 Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Taylor of Tennessee.  
 Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mr. Culkin.  
 Mr. McCormack with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.  
 Mr. Byrns of Tennessee with Mr. Maas.  
 Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Hartley.  
 Mr. Cox with Mr. August H. Andresen.  
 Mr. Dies with Mr. Guyer of Kansas.  
 Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Risk.  
 Mr. Thomason with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.  
 Mr. Richards with Mr. McDowell.  
 Mr. Chandler with Mr. Grant of Indiana.  
 Mr. Kelly with Mr. Case of South Dakota.  
 Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Eaton of California.  
 Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Andrews.  
 Mr. Claypool with Mr. Magnuson.  
 Mrs. Norton with Mr. Courtney.  
 Mr. Cummings with Mr. Buckley of New York.  
 Mr. Pearson with Mr. Connery.  
 Mr. Secrest with Mr. Evans.  
 Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Gore.  
 Mr. Merritt with Mr. Shanley.  
 Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Byrne of New York.  
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Edmiston.  
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Smith of Connecticut.  
 Mr. Flannery with Mr. Curley.  
 Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Shannon.

Mr. MURRAY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. GEARHART changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 221, nays 124, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

YEAS—221

Allen, La.	Anderson, Calif.	Angell	Ashbrook
Allen, Pa.	Anderson, Mo.	Arnold	Ball



Barden	Ellis	Kunkel	Reece, Tenn.	Smith, Conn.	Stearns, N. H.	Taylor, Tenn.	White, Idaho
Barnes	Faddis	Lanham	Robertson	Smith, Ill.	Sullivan	Thomas, N. J.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Barry	Fay	Lea	Robinson, Utah	Smith, Ohio	Sumners, Tex.	Thomason	Woodrum, Va.
Bates, Ky.	Flaherty	Leavy	Rogers, Mass.	Somers, N. Y.	Taylor, Colo.	Wheat	
Beam	Flannagan	Lemke	Rogers, Okla.				
Beckworth	Folger	Lesinski	Romjue				
Bell	Ford, Miss.	Lewis, Colo.	Ryan				
Boehne	Ford, Thomas F.	Lewis, Ohio	Sabath				
Boland	Fries	Ludlow	Sacks				
Boren	Fulmer	McAndrews	Sasser				
Boykin	Garrett	McArdle	Satterfield				
Bradley, Pa.	Gathings	McGehee	Schaefer, Ill.				
Brooks	Gavagan	McGranery	Schuetz				
Brown, Ga.	Gearhart	McKeough	Schulte				
Bryson	Gehrmann	McLaughlin	Schwert				
Buck	Geyer, Calif.	McMillan, John L.	Secrest				
Buckler, Minn.	Gibbs	Mahon	Sheppard				
Burch	Gossett	Maloney	Sirovich				
Burdick	Green	Mansfield	Smith, Va.				
Burgin	Gregory	Marcantonio	Smith, Wash.				
Byrne, N. Y.	Griffith	Martin, Colo.	Smith, W. Va.				
Byron	Hall	Martin, Ill.	Snyder				
Caldwell	Harrington	Massingale	South				
Cannon, Fla.	Hart	May	Sparkman				
Cannon, Mo.	Harter, N. Y.	Miller	Spence				
Chapman	Harter, Ohio	Mills, Ark.	Starnes, Ala.				
Clark	Havenner	Mills, La.	Steagall				
Cochran	Healey	Monroney	Sutphin				
Coffee, Nebr.	Hendricks	Moser	Sweeney				
Cole, Md.	Hennings	Mouton	Tarver				
Collins	Hill	Murdock, Ariz.	Tenerowicz				
Colmer	Hobbs	Murdock, Utah	Terry				
Cooley	Hook	Myers	Thill				
Costello	Houston	Nelson	Thomas, Tex.				
Creal	Hull	Nichols	Tolan				
Crosser	Hunter	Norrell	Vincent, Ky.				
Crowe	Izac	O'Connor	Vinson, Ga.				
Cullen	Jacobsen	O'Day	Voorhis, Calif.				
D'Alesandro	Jarman	O'Leary	Wallgren				
Darden	Johnson, Lyndon	O'Neal	Walter				
Delaney	Johnson, Okla.	Pace	Ward				
Dempsey	Johnson, W. Va.	Parsons	Warren				
DeRouen	Jones, Tex.	Patman	Weaver				
Dickstein	Keller	Patton	Welch				
Dingell	Kennedy, Martin	Peterson, Fla.	West				
Disney	Kennedy, Md.	Peterson, Ga.	Whichel				
Doughton	Kennedy, Michael	Pfeifer	Whittington				
Doxey	Keogh	Pierce, Oreg.	Williams, Mo.				
Drewry	Kerr	Poage	Willerton, N. J.				
Duncan	Kilday	Polk	Wood				
Dunn	Kitchens	Ramspeck	Zimmerman				
Durham	Kleberg	Randolph					
Eberhart	Kociakowski	Rankin					
Elliot	Kramer	Rayburn					

## NAYS—124

Alexander	Engel	Kean	Rodgers, Pa.
Allen, Ill.	Englebright	Keefe	Routzohn
Andersen, H. Carl	Fenton	Kinzer	Rutherford
Arends	Fish	Knutson	Sandager
Austin	Ford, Leland M.	Landis	Schafer, Wis.
Barton	Gamble	LeCompte	Schiffner
Bates, Mass.	Gartner	Luce	Secombe
Bender	Gerlach	McLean	Seger
Blackney	Gifford	McLeod	Shafer, Mich.
Bolles	Gillie	Mapes	Short
Brewster	Graham	Marshall	Smith, Maine
Brown, Ohio	Gross	Martin, Iowa	Springer
Carlson	Gwynne	Martin, Mass.	Stefan
Carter	Halleck	Mason	Sumner, Ill.
Chipperfield	Hancock	Michener	Taber
Church	Harness	Monkiewicz	Talle
Clason	Hawks	Mott	Thorkelson
Clevenger	Heinke	Mundt	Tibbott
Cole, N. Y.	Hess	Murray	Tinkham
Corbett	Hinshaw	O'Brien	Treadway
Crawford	Hoffman	Oliver	Van Zandt
Crowther	Hope	Osmer	Vorys, Ohio
Curtis	Horton	Pierce, N. Y.	Vreeland
Darrow	Jarrett	Pittenger	Wadsworth
Dirksen	Jenkins, Ohio	Powers	White, Ohio
Ditter	Jenks, N. H.	Reed, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Dondero	Jensen	Reed, N. Y.	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Johns	Rees, Kans.	Winter
Dowell	Johnson, Ill.	Rich	Wolcott
Dworshak	Johnson, Ind.	Robison, Ky.	Woodruff, Mich.
Elston	Jones, Ohio	Rockefeller	Youngdahl

## NOT VOTING—83

Andersen, A. H.	Connery	Gore	Maas
Andrews	Cooper	Grant, Ala.	Maclejewski
Bland	Courtney	Grant, Ind.	Magnuson
Bloom	Cox	Guyer, Kans.	Merritt
Bolton	Culkin	Hare	Mitchell
Bradley, Mich.	Cummings	Hartley	Norton
Buckley, N. Y.	Curley	Holmes	O'Toole
Bulwinkle	Dies	Jeffries	Patrick
Byrns, Tenn.	Eaton, Calif.	Johnson, Luther	Pearson
Cartwright	Eaton, N. J.	Kee	Plumley
Case, S. Dak.	Edmiston	Kelly	Rabaut
Casey, Mass.	Evans	Kirwan	Richards
Celler	Ferguson	Lambertson	Risk
Chandler	Fernandez	Larrabee	Scrigham
Claypool	Fitzpatrick	McCormack	Shanley
Cluett	Flannery	McDowell	Shannon
Coffee, Wash.	Gilchrist	McMillan, Thos. S.	Simpson

Smith, Conn.  
Smith, Ill.  
Smith, Ohio  
Somers, N. Y.

Stearns, N. H.  
Sullivan  
Sumners, Tex.  
Taylor, Colo.

Taylor, Tenn.  
Thomas, N. J.  
Thomason  
Wheat

White, Idaho  
Wolfenden, Pa.  
Woodrum, Va.

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Cooper (for) with Mr. Plumley (against).  
Mr. Ferguson (for) with Mr. Smith of Ohio (against).  
Mr. Kee (for) with Mr. Gilchrist (against).  
Mr. Coffee of Washington (for) with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania (against).  
Mr. O'Toole (for) with Mr. Cluett (against).  
Mr. Larrabee (for) with Mr. Jeffries (against).  
Mr. Bloom (for) with Mr. Bradley of Michigan (against).  
Mr. Magnuson (for) with Mr. Andrews (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Bland with Mr. Eaton of New Jersey.  
Mr. Thomas S. McMillan with Mr. Bolton.  
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Holmes.  
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Taylor of Tennessee.  
Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mr. Culkin.  
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.  
Mr. Byrns of Tennessee with Mr. Maas.  
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Hartley.  
Mr. Cox with Mr. August H. Andresen.  
Mr. Dies with Mr. Guyer of Kansas.  
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Risk.  
Mr. Thomason with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.  
Mr. Richards with Mr. McDowell.  
Mr. Chandler with Mr. Grant of Indiana.  
Mr. Kelly with Mr. Case of South Dakota.  
Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Eaton of California.  
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Claypool.  
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Courtney.  
Mr. Scrigham with Mr. Lambertson.  
Mr. Hare with Mr. Simpson.  
Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Wheat.  
Mr. Pearson with Mr. Connery.  
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Shanley.  
Mr. Celler with Mr. Edmiston.  
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Smith of Connecticut.  
Mr. Flannery with Mr. Shannon.  
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Cummings.  
Mr. Evans with Mr. Grant of Alabama.  
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Gore.  
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Curley.

Mr. HILL changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BYRON], who was called from the floor, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks may be extended in the RECORD to include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from a speech made by Col. E. W. Jordan, of Roanoke, Va., at the annual encampment of the Spanish-American War veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## LICENSING OF CIVILIAN MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS, ETC.

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 257), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

## House Resolution 257

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 5138, a bill to make unlawful attempts to overthrow the Government of the United States; to require licensing of civilian military organizations; to make unlawful attempts to interfere with the discipline of the Army and Navy; to require registration and fingerprinting of aliens; to enlarge the jurisdiction of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in certain cases; and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the

chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks, and include a letter from Hon. J. J. McEntee, acting director of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by including a short editorial appearing in the Brooklyn Daily Eagle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects, and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## EXPLANATION

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleagues, Mr. COFFEE of Washington and Mr. MAGNUSON, were both unavoidably called from the House. Had they been present they would have voted "no" on the motion to recommit and "aye" on the passage of the joint resolution.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Chairman of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and a brief statement of the workings of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a short editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from today's New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. O'TOOLE, indefinitely, on account of serious illness.

To Mr. HARE, for 2 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. FERGUSON, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. RISK, for 3 days, on account of important business.

## REQUEST FROM SENATE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following request from the Senate of the United States:

The Clerk read as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

July 13 (legislative day, July 10), 1939.

Ordered: That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate a joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 155, entitled "Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas."

The SPEAKER. Without objection the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

## ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO VOTE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and could not be in the Chamber at the vote just taken. Had I been here, I would have voted "yea."

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial from the Indianapolis Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes tomorrow afternoon after the completion of the legislative program for the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order heretofore entered the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized.

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETING, SATURDAY, JULY 15, 1939, RE CERTAIN FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had for my breakfast delicious American-prepared bacon, which cost me 15 cents per pound at a retail store here in Washington. We are using in our home American-made lard, which is retailing in Washington at 7½ cents a pound, or 2 pounds for 15 cents. I have just torn from the Evening Star of Thursday, July 13, and hold here in my hand a full-page advertisement showing that these prices will prevail in the retail store of Washington tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time there are 257,127,595 bushels of corn under commodity-credit loan in this country on which the Government has advanced loans through the Commodity Credit Corporation. The farmers of this country, according to the Department of Agriculture report of July 10, hold on farms 836,921,000 bushels of corn—old stock. The Department's recent estimate of corn production for the coming crop is 2,570,795,000 bushels. In the feeding pens of this country are millions of pounds of pork and lard wrapped up in hides on the way to market.

Tonight's papers carry the story that wheat prices slumped today on the Liverpool market below 1931 dark-day prices, a drop to about 85 cents per 100 pounds for July delivery options. This is an illustration of what the farmers of this country face in the disposition of their grains and cottonseed oils, their corn, and their corn products in the form of pork and fats.

I am calling the attention of the House to some of these facts today in the hope that Members from the cotton States and the corn-producing States will give serious attention to this price situation which now prevails and lower prices which undoubtedly will prevail during the next few months, all in the hope that the Members of the House will meet in the caucus room of the old House Office Building next Saturday morning at 11 o'clock to confer with reference to steps that may be taken in connection with the use of section 32 blue-stamp money in alleviating the situation during the coming months, say, up to next January 1, 1940.

I have conferred with certain officials and certain leading Members of the House on the Committee on Agriculture, and I think we shall be able to obtain considerable support from Administration circles in connection with using some of the money recently appropriated to meet the situation for the present time.



It appears to me that the corn growers of this country will in due course divert a considerable proportion of the corn crop into loan stocks, instead of feeding it to hogs as heretofore. Certainly if pork and lard are to move into consumption at present or lower prices, this will induce farmers to secure loans and store corn, rather than feed to livestock for market to be sold at such ruinous prices as now prevail. We may find a situation in corn stocks under loan much more aggravating than is cotton at present. It is reasonable to assume that if such low prices are to prevail on pork and lard that the cotton grower will have to suffer proportionately in connection with lower prices for cottonseed oil. We should now give our most serious attention to this problem, and all looking forward to alleviating conditions as best we can during the next several months. I hope you will join with us next Saturday morning at 11 o'clock, so that an intelligent and full discussion may be had covering this problem, which is of such vital interest to the entire South, the West, the North, and the East. All farmers and industrialists should be vitally concerned about these developments, and every Member of the House has an interest in this problem.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today by printing in the RECORD the statement I spoke about in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to give the names of the members of the executive committee of the Roosevelt Library, Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]?

There was no objection.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1882. An act for the relief of Otis M. Culver, Samuel E. Abbey, Joseph Reger, and August H. Krueger.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 289. An act for the relief of the West Virginia Co.;

S. 1575. An act to provide that the annual registration of motor vehicles and the annual licensing of certain public vehicles in the District of Columbia shall be for the period from April 1 in each year to March 31 in the succeeding year; and

S. 2336. An act to authorize an exchange of lands at the Fort Francis E. Warren Military Reservation, Wyo.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 14, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Saturday, July 15, 1939, Dr. C. E. R. Sherrington, British railroad expert, will testify before the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the bills H. R. 6369 and S. 1869 to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto; to create a railroad reorganization court, and for other purposes. The hearing will be public, and will begin at 10 a. m. in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

## COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Naval Affairs at 10 a. m., Friday, July 14, 1939, for the consideration of

general legislation and for the consideration of H. R. 6799, to regulate the assignments of naval officers to duty, and for other purposes.

## COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings in room 219, House Office Building, at 10 a. m., on the bills and dates listed below:

On Tuesday, July 18, 1939, at 10 a. m., hearings will be held on H. R. 7090, to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 46, sec. 481), and H. R. 7091, to amend section 4471 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 46, 464).

## COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on Monday, July 17, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 207, to authorize the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to assist the governments of American republics to increase their military and naval establishments, and for other purposes.

The Foreign Affairs Committee will start hearings on Tuesday, July 18, 1939, at 10 a. m., on proposed legislation dealing with treaty violations, with special reference to the Orient: H. R. 4232 (Mr. VOORHIS of California), H. R. 5432 (Mr. COFFEE of Washington), H. R. 6837 (Mr. EATON of New Jersey), House Joint Resolution 42 (Mr. CRAWFORD), House Joint Resolution 113 (Mr. FISH), House Joint Resolution 254 (Mr. FISH), House Joint Resolution 318 (Mr. WALLGREN).

## COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Monday, July 17, 1939, at 10 a. m., in room 328 House Office Building, to consider H. R. 6668.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

983. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1940, amounting to \$1,023,000 (H. Doc. No. 402); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

984. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate for the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1940, amounting to \$58,000 (H. Doc. No. 403); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

985. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1940 amounting to \$425,000 (H. Doc. No. 404); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

986. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1940 amounting to \$54,500 (H. Doc. No. 405); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

987. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting an estimate of appropriation in the amount of \$346.48, submitted by the Department of Justice, to pay claims for damages to any person or damages to or loss of privately owned property caused by employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (H. Doc. No. 406); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

988. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission for the fiscal year 1940 amounting to \$210,000 (H. Doc. No. 407); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

989. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1940 for the Department of Agriculture in the sum of \$75,000 (H. Doc. No. 408); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

990. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1939 amounting to \$3,500 (H. Doc. No. 409); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

991. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which have been submitted by the Attorney General through the Secretary of the Treasury and require an appropriation for their payment amounting to \$1,313,906.01 (H. Doc. No. 410); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

992. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Surgeon General, Public Health Service, to pay a claim for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of a vessel of the Public Health Service in the sum of \$150 (H. Doc. No. 411); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

993. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to privately owned property in the sum of \$19,746.07 (H. Doc. No. 412); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

994. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department to pay a claim for damages incident to the operation of a vessel of the Navy in the sum of \$341.93 (H. Doc. No. 413); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

995. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claim for damages under river and harbor work in the sum of \$587.50 (H. Doc. No. 414); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

996. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a schedule of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office as shown by certificate of settlement forwarded to the Treasury Department for payment amounting to \$1,358.20 (H. Doc. No. 415); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

997. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by the United States district courts as submitted by the Attorney General through the Secretary of the Treasury and which require an appropriation for their payment amounting to \$12,856.75 (H. Doc. No. 416); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

998. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell or lease for park or recreational purposes, and to sell for cemetery purposes, certain public lands in Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. Senate Concurrent Resolution 26. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate on the bill (S. 2009) entitled "Transportation Act of 1939" (Rept. No. 1114). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. Senate Concurrent Resolution 25. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of the Committee on Finance on the investigation of existing profit-sharing systems between employers and employees in the United States (Rept. No. 1115). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 24. Concurrent resolution to print House Document No. 212 with Concurrent Resolution No. 12, adopted March 16, 1939, deleted, and the legend "Not printed at Government expense" substituted (Rept. No. 1116). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 29. Concurrent resolution to print and bind the proceedings of Congress, together with the proceedings at the unveiling in the rotunda, upon acceptance of the statue of Will Rogers, presented by the State of Oklahoma (Rept. No. 1117). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BUCK: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6479. A bill amending section 2857 of the Distilled Spirits Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BUCK: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6268. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to make certain allowances for losses by leakage and evaporation upon withdrawal of packages of brandy or fruit spirits under certain conditions; without amendment (Rept. No. 1119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 474. An act to amend section 92 of the Judicial Code to provide for a term of court at Kalispell, Mont.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1141). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 3391. A bill providing payment to employees, Bureau of Reclamation, for mileage traveled in privately owned automobiles; without amendment (Rept. No. 1142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6832. A bill to provide for the protection of witnesses appearing before any department, independent establishment, or other agency of the United States, or the Congress of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1143). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 6506. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for Indian use; with amendment (Rept. No. 1145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 257. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5138, a bill to make unlawful attempts to overthrow the Government of the United States; to require licensing of civilian military organizations; to make unlawful attempts to interfere with the discipline of the Army and Navy; to require registration and fingerprinting of aliens; to enlarge the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals in certain cases; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1146). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5982. A bill for the protection against unlawful use of the badge, medal, emblem, or other insignia of veterans' organizations incorporated by act of Congress, and providing penalties for the violation thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 1147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 6379. A bill to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406); without amendment (Rept. No. 1148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6324. A bill to provide for the more expeditious settlement of disputes with the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.



# REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 68. An act for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEEFE: Committee on Claims. S. 809. An act for the relief of Jessie M. Durst; with amendment (Rept. No. 1121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on Claims. S. 811. An act for the relief of George A. Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HALL: Committee on Claims. S. 927. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Suncrest Orchards, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 1042. An act for the relief of the Epes Transportation Corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EBERHARTER: Committee on Claims. S. 1414. An act for the relief of Allie Holsomback and Lonnie Taylor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1448. An act for the relief of Anna H. Rosa; with amendment (Rept. No. 1126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FENTON: Committee on Claims. S. 1812. An act for the relief of A. E. Bostrom; without amendment (Rept. No. 1127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FENTON: Committee on Claims. S. 1821. An act for the relief of Harry K. Snyder; with amendment (Rept. No. 1128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEEFE: Committee on Claims. S. 2061. An act for the relief of William Hillock; without amendment (Rept. No. 1129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2440. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 1130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ELLIS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2919. A bill for the relief of Marie K. Trottnow; with amendment (Rept. No. 1131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3051. A bill for the relief of certain workers performing emergency work at Cairo, Ill., in the Ohio River flood of 1937; with amendment (Rept. No. 1132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3569. A bill for the relief of J. Aristide Lefevre; with amendment (Rept. No. 1133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3933. A bill for the relief of Otho L. Curtner; with amendment (Rept. No. 1134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4606. A bill for the relief of the Toledo Terminal Railroad Co. of Toledo, Ohio; with amendment (Rept. No. 1135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4726. A bill for the relief of James W. Gilson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5514. A bill for the relief of L. W. Marek, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5923. A bill for the relief of Simon A. Brieger; with amendment (Rept. No. 1138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEEFE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6030. A bill for the relief of Russell B. Hendrix; with amendment (Rept. No. 1139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEEFE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6728. A bill for the relief of Stacy C. Mosser, receiver for the Great Northern Majestic Building Corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 7052. A bill to provide a posthumous advancement in grade for the late Ensign Joseph Hester Patterson, United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6146) granting a pension to George W. Grigsby, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7187. A bill to establish a Circuit Court of Appeals for Patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 7188. A bill to remove certain restrictions on the character of international broadcasts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSER:

H. R. 7189. A bill to authorize research and experiments to find new uses for anthracite coal; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. R. 7190. A bill to authorize the construction of buildings and other facilities for the use of the Government on lands conveyed to the United States by the city of Alameda, Calif., on what is known as Government Island, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 7191. A bill to make more equitable provision for pensions for the dependents of deceased veterans of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 7192. A bill to amend the patent laws to provide for the granting of licenses under patents brought within a single control by competitors to dominate an industry; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. GAVAGAN:

H. R. 7193. A bill prohibiting the use of military uniforms or arms by certain organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Texas:

H. J. Res. 357. Joint resolution designating September 11 to 24, 1939, as a period for the national observance of air progress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio:

H. J. Res. 358. Joint resolution construing the phrase "ultimate purchaser," as contained in section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended by section 3 of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1077); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROWTHER:

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 360. Joint resolution to change the design of United States 10-cent pieces to include an engraving of Benjamin Franklin; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 258. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Joint Resolution No. 32A, with reference to the Wagner-Van Nuys-Capper antilynching bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 7194. A bill for the relief of Hattie Dillon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7195. A bill for the relief of Garabed Meghrihan; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 7196. A bill for the relief of Hemayak Meghrihan; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 7197. A bill for the relief of Albert W. Toner; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7198. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Navy of Clyde S. McDowell, a captain, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 7199. A bill for the relief of First Lt. Rosanna M. King, Army Nurse Corps, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. R. 7200. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Chris Nielsen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 7201. A bill granting a pension to Lura H. P. Markley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7202. A bill granting a pension to Lu M. Linscott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7203. A bill granting a pension to Elsie M. Lum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7204. A bill granting a pension to Kathryn E. Fraley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7205. A bill granting a pension to Margaret Haskin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7206. A bill granting a pension to Irene C. Flack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7207. A bill granting a pension to Olivia Stebbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7208. A bill granting a pension to May Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7209. A bill granting a pension to Della Bond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7210. A bill granting a pension to Ida Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7211. A bill granting a pension to Daisey Vredenburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7212. A bill granting a pension to Clara L. Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7213. A bill granting a pension to Ella E. Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 7214. A bill granting a pension to Annie E. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7215. A bill granting a pension to Hattie Harvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7216. A bill granting a pension to Rebecca Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7217. A bill granting a pension to Mary Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7218. A bill granting a pension to Nora Henley Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

LXXXIV—572

H. R. 7219. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Lake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7220. A bill granting a pension to Martha Story; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7221. A bill granting a pension to Mary E. Ringer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7222. A bill granting a pension to Myrtle Payne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7223. A bill granting a pension to Herthe L. R. Whitney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7224. A bill granting a pension to Cinda Forbes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7225. A bill granting a pension to Lucy E. Huff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7226. A bill granting a pension to Hattie Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7227. A bill granting a pension to Sarah L. Ellison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7228. A bill granting a pension to Charlie Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7229. A bill granting a pension to Joke Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 7230. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4635. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of Peter Marchilton and sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., protesting against the reduction in hourly rate of pay on Works Progress Administration projects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4636. By Mr. GAMBLE: Petition signed by Walter MacKellar and other residents of New York State, urging the immediate enactment of "mandatory, stay-out-of-war" legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4637. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition of the members of Historical Records Survey, project 8995, San Francisco, Calif., urging Congress to expand the Works Progress Administration program to provide useful work for at least 3,000,000 of America's 12,000,000 unemployed, and to remove all restrictive clauses from the recently enacted Works Progress Administration bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4638. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Steve Collins, of Mart, Tex., favoring House bill 6749; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4639. By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, of New York City, urging restoration of the prevailing wage scale in the Works Progress Administration relief appropriation bill and other changes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4640. Also, petition of the United States Office and Professional Workers of America, opposing the Smith bill for investigation of the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Labor.

4641. Also, petition of New York State Economic Council, Inc., pertaining to the elimination from Works Progress Administration relief of the prevailing rate of wages; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4642. Also, petition of the Cowles Detergent Co. of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the Smith resolution to investigate the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Labor.

4643. Also, petition of the Joseph R. Bergey Co. of New York City, urging enactment of the Kings Canyon Park bill with certain amendments; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

4644. Also, petition of the Works Progress Administration Teachers Union, Local No. 453, of New York City, urging



enactment of legislation to restore the prevailing-wage scale in the Works Progress Administration appropriation bill and other changes; to the Committee on Labor.

4645. Also, petition of the New York State Waterways Association, opposing the Wheeler-Lea bill for the regulation of water transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4646. Also, petition of Labor's Council, United Federal Workers of America, favoring enactment of House bill 6327 and Senate bill 2449, pertaining to United States customs laborers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4647. Also, petition of the Social Service Employees Union of New York City, advocating restoration of the prevailing wage clause and Works Progress Administration theater projects, also urging abolishment of the 60-day waiting period and decentralization of Art Project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4648. Also, petition of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers of Albany, N. Y., opposing any investigation of the National Labor Relations Board and its administration of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

4649. Also, petition of the Internal Revenue, Local No. 47, United Federal Workers of America, opposing enactment of House bills 4960, 5643, 5138, and Senate bills 408 and 410; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4650. Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, expressing approval of President Roosevelt's recommendation for a \$3,860,000,000 recovery fund in the form of self-liquidating projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4651. Also, petition of the Conference of Independent Bakery Owners and Managers, favoring amendment of the National Labor Relations Act in such manner as will cause it to operate uniformly upon both employer and employee; to the Committee on Labor.

4652. Also, petition of the American Whaling Information Service of New York City, pertaining to the newly revived American whaling industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

4653. Also, petition of the New York State League of Savings and Loan Associations, urging enactment of House bill 6971; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4654. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of Hon. James Garfield Stewart, mayor, city of Cincinnati, favoring the passage of

the Barkley bill (S. 685); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

4655. Also, petition of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Albany, N. Y., concerning the investigation of the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Labor.

4656. Also, petition of the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, New York City, concerning the 1939-40 work-relief bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4657. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Valve Pilot Corporation, New York City, urging support of the Smith resolution (H. J. Res. 229), for investigation of the Labor Board; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4658. Also, petition of Abraham & Straus, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Sullivan bill (H. R. 6479) to amend section 2857 of the Federal Distilled Spirits Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4659. Also, petition of Sperry Products, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the passage of the Smith resolution, to investigate the National Labor Board; to the Committee on Labor.

4660. Also, petition of the E. W. Bliss Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging consideration of the Smith resolution (H. J. Res. 229), to investigate the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Labor.

4661. Also, petition of George D. Brown, secretary, New York State Division of Housing, New York City, urging consideration of House bill 2888; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4662. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution of the annual convention, Department of Michigan, Veterans of Foreign Wars, urging adoption of legislation to extend civil-service benefits to all Government employees of the same degree as those now receiving them; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

4663. Also, resolution of the Conference of Independent Bakery Owners and Managers, urging amendment of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

4664. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Alabama Cotton Cooperative Association, Montgomery, Ala., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 5269, for pink bollworm control and eradication work; to the Committee on Agriculture.